arXiv:1704.04291v1 [math.SG] 13 Apr 2017

BRANE STRUCTURES IN MICROLOCAL SHEAF THEORY

XIN JIN AND DAVID TREUMANN

ABSTRACT. Let L be an exact Lagrangian submanifold of a cotangent bundle T^*M, asymptotic to a Legendrian submanifold $\Lambda \subset T^\infty M$. We study a locally constant sheaf of ∞-categories on L, called the sheaf of brane structures or Brane_L. Its fiber is the ∞-category of spectra, and we construct a Hamiltonian invariant, fully faithful functor from $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ to the ∞-category of sheaves of spectra on M with singular support in Λ.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Sheaves of spectra 9
3. Wavefronts, brane structures, and Nadler-Zaslow 20
References 34

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates the following corollary of the main result of [NaZa]:

Theorem (Nadler-Zaslow)**.** Let L be an exact Lagrangian submanifold of a cotangent bundle T^*M, asymptotic to a Legendrian submanifold $\Lambda \subset T^\infty M$. If the brane obstructions on L vanish, there is a fully faithful functor

$$\mathrm{Loc}(L) \to \mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(M) \tag{1.0.1}$$

from local systems on L, to constructible sheaves on M with singular support over Λ.

Nadler and Zaslow deduce this theorem using Floer theory — more precisely, they embed the category of local systems on L into a Fukaya category of T^*M, and produce a full embedding of this Fukaya category into the derived category of sheaves on M. Our aim is to give a purely sheaf-theoretic construction of (1.0.1), one that is "soft" enough to apply to sheaves of spectra.

1.1. Exact Lagrangians and wavefronts.

Let α denote the one-form

$$\alpha = \xi_1 dx_1 + \cdots + \xi_n dx_n \tag{1.1.1}$$

so that $-d\alpha$ is the standard symplectic form on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. A Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ is called exact if there is an $f : L \to \mathbf{R}$ with $df = \alpha|_L$. Exact Lagrangians are intensively studied, partly to avoid analytic issues that arise in Floer theory of more general Lagrangians. A more intrinsic reason to study exact Lagrangians is a variant of the Arnold conjecture, which asserts that exact Lagrangians have a *topological* nature: taken up to Hamiltonian isotopy, they have no moduli.

The theory of the wavefront projection shows one aspect of the topological nature of exact Lagrangians. If L is connected, the function f is unique up to an additive constant.

The wavefront projection is the (immersed, singular) hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ parametrized by $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, f)$. One recovers L from those $n+1$ coordinates as $\xi_i = \partial f / \partial x_i$. In fact if L is in general position, it can be uniquely recovered from just the image $\mathbf{F} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ of the wavefront immersion $L \to \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

Example. There are no embedded exact Lagrangians in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ that are compact — we discuss this further in §1.3. But the wavefront map makes sense for immersed Lagrangians $L \to \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, here is an example in $\mathbf{R}^2$:



The left-hand figure displays $(x, \xi) : L \to \mathbf{R}^2$, which is exact so long as the area of the central bigon is equal to the sum of the areas enclosed by the two outer lobes. The right-hand figure is the wavefront hypersurface $\mathbf{F}$ — note the two singularities where the map $(x, f) : L \to \mathbf{R}^2$ fails to be an immersion.

1.2. **Isotopies.** Part of the topological nature of exact Lagrangians is illustrated by the following Proposition:

Proposition. Suppose that L_1 and L_2 are two embedded exact Lagrangians with associated wavefront hypersurfaces $\mathbf{F}_1$ and $\mathbf{F}_2$. If there is a smooth isotopy of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ carrying $\mathbf{F}_1$ to $\mathbf{F}_2$, then L_1 and L_2 are Hamiltonian isotopic.

The converse of this Proposition is false. For example, the following two fragments of wavefronts are associated to a pair of Hamiltonian isotopic Lagrangians:



For small n, there is a finite list of such "Reidemeister moves" that generate the equivalence relation on exact Lagrangians given by Hamiltonian isotopy. We warn that this is not so for $n \geq 7$.

1.3. **Compact and noncompact Lagrangians.** The discussion of §1.1 applies more generally with $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ replaced by the cotangent bundle of a manifold M — if the x_i are local coordinates on M, then (1.1.1) is independent of those coordinates. The wavefront map of an exact Lagrangian $L \subset T^*M$ takes values in $M \times \mathbf{R}$, and the Proposition of §1.2 holds in this setting. The Arnold conjecture predicts that the only compact exact Lagrangian in T^*M, up to Hamiltonian isotopy, is the zero section M. Floer theory [Ab, Kr1], and some alternatives [Guil], have been used to tightly circumscribe any potential counterexamples to this conjecture — a strong result along these lines is that any compact exact Lagrangian in T^*M must be homotopy equivalent to M. The theory that we develop here is inspired

by this work, but it could not be used to deduce any new results about compact L. Our aim is different.

Noncompact exact Lagrangians are abundant. In dimension 4, they are associated with a rich combinatorics of cluster algebras [STWZ]. In some complex varieties, they are associated with perverse sheaves, especially with tilting sheaves [J1], [J2]. These examples have been studied by us elsewhere using Nadler-Zaslow's (1.0.1). Our results here remove the dependence of Floer theory, in the same spirit of some of Tamarkin's work giving sheaf-theoretic alternatives for the classic applications of Floer theory.

1.4. **Coefficients.** The Floer-theoretic constructions of [NaZa] give a functor (1.0.1) from local systems of $\mathbf{k}$-modules to constructible sheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-modules, where $\mathbf{k}$ is any commutative ring. Our version is sufficiently soft that we may replace $\mathbf{k}$ by a ring spectrum — but this requires us to revisit the notion of a brane obstruction. We discuss this briefly here, and more in §1.6.

(We remark that our discussion only requires $\mathbf{k}$ to be E_2-commutative, in other words commutative enough that we may speak of "$\mathbf{k}$-linear" stable ∞-categories.[1] But in this paper we do not explore this in any significant way.)

> **Proposition/Definition.** Let $\mathbf{k}$ be an E_2-commutative ring spectrum, and let $L \subset T^*M$ be an exact Lagrangian. Then L carries a canonical locally constant sheaf of $\mathbf{k}$-linear categories Brane_L, whose fiber is equivalent to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$. We say that the *brane obstruction of L vanishes* with coefficients in $\mathbf{k}$ if this locally constant sheaf is constant.

What we will construct canonically is a functor $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \to \mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(M, \mathbf{k})$. A trivialization of Brane_L gives an equivalence $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \cong \mathrm{Loc}(L; \mathbf{k})$. In general, $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ can be identified with the category of modules over a famous associative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra spectrum — the Thom spectrum of the map $L \to B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})$.

The sheaf of categories, and something more general, is an essentially standard construction in microlocal sheaf theory. (In [TZ] one of us has called it the "Kashiwara-Schapira sheaf;" in [Guil] it is called the "Kashiwara-Schapira stack.") The foundational text [KaSc] of the theory is significantly older than the foundational text of ∞-category theory [Lu1], which we require to make sense of the Proposition above. In §2 we give some details about how to adapt microlocal sheaf theory to treat sheaves of spectra.

1.5. **Singular support and front projections.** To have a good theory of noncompact exact Lagrangians §1.3, we impose boundary conditions: we require that L should be asymptotic to a Legendrian submanifold $\Lambda \subset T^\infty M$. Here $T^\infty M$ is a cosphere bundle of infinite radius, the boundary of T^*M with its natural contact structure. We will denote the projection of a Legendrian $\Lambda \subset T^\infty M$ by $\Phi \subset M$, and often make the following hypothesis:

$$\Lambda \to \Phi \text{ is finite-to-one} \tag{1.5.1}$$

When (1.5.1) holds, Λ induces a coorientation on the smooth parts of Φ, and Λ can be recovered from Φ as its conormal lift — in that case we call Φ the "front projection" of Λ. The wavefront projection of an exact Lagrangian (the situation of §1.1) can be treated as a special case — see §3.5.

(Throughout the paper, we use "front projection" for Legendrians and "wavefront projection" for exact Lagrangians, though this is not at all standard or historical.)

[1] Even this assumption can be relaxed: if $\mathbf{k}'$ is an associative $\mathbf{k}$-algebra, then (1.0.1) induces a functor from left $\mathbf{k}'$-module objects in $\mathrm{Loc}(L; \mathbf{k})$ to left $\mathbf{k}'$-module objects in $\mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(M; \mathbf{k})$.

Suppose F is a sheaf on M with singular support in Λ — or rather, in the conic Lagrangian subset of T^*M obtained by taking the union of the zero section ζ_M with the cone over Λ. The theory of singular supports was introduced and developed by Kashiwara and Schapira [KaSc]. One gets a sense of what it means to have singular support in Λ by studying the structure of F near the smooth points, multiple points, and singular points of the front Φ.

1.5.1. *Smooth part.* The front projection breaks M into chambers, the connected components of $M - \Phi$, on which F is locally constant. At a smooth point $x \in \Phi$ a small ball around x will be broken into two contractible chambers, R_1 and R_2, so that F is constant along R_1 and R_2. One can use the restriction maps of F to give a map $F(R_1) \to F(R_2)$ against the co-orientation of Φ.



$$F(R_1) \to F(R_2)$$

(1.5.2)

The singular support condition implies that these restriction maps (which we often imagine as drawn on M, as in the diagram (1.5.3)) completely determine F near a smooth point. They vary in a locally constant fashion along the smooth part of Φ.

1.5.2. *Double and multiple points.* Near a double point of Φ (i.e., a point where $\Lambda \to \Phi$ is two-to-one, but still an immersion), we get a square of restriction maps



(1.5.3)

The sheaf structure of F makes this a commutative square (even in the ∞-categorical sense: a functor from $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1$ to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$); the singular support condition implies that it is *exact*, i.e. it is both a pushout and a pullback square in the stable ∞-category $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$. Near a multiple point of degree n (with n branches intersecting transversely) the picture is similar: there, one has an exact n-cube, i.e. a commutative n-cube all of whose square faces are exact.

1.5.3. *Singular points of a front.* If $\Lambda \to \Phi \to M$ fails to be an immersion at $x \in \Lambda$, the image of x in M is called a singular point of Φ. Here are two examples, where Λ has dimension 1 and 2:



The figure on the left is the "fold" or "cusp" singularity. The figure on the right is the critical front of the D_4^--bifurcation of fronts [Arn2, Ch. 22], which is also of interest as the wavefront projection of a holomorphic Lagrangian (the graph of $\pm\sqrt{z}dz$).

Near a singular point, Φ breaks M into chambers and lower-dimensional strata which can fit together in a complicated way. Still it is sometimes possible to describe the structure of F near a singular point concretely. A description for the examples pictured above is fairly simple: at a cusp the two restriction maps must compose (in one direction) to the identity [KaSc, Ex. 5.3.4], and at a critical D_4^- front we get a triple of exact commutative squares glued at their source and sink:



(1.5.4)

1.6. **Microlocal monodromy and brane obstruction.** Let F be a sheaf with singular support in Λ, where Λ and Φ are as in §1.5. Let us introduce a notation: we write $\Lambda^{sm} \subset \Lambda^{imm} \subset \Lambda$ for the set where $\Lambda \to M$ is an embedding resp. an immersion. At each point $P \in \Lambda^{sm}$, we define $\mu_P(F)$ to be the cone on the map (1.5.2). We refer to $\mu_P(F)$ as a "microlocal stalk" of F at P. The spectra μ_P are the stalks of a local system on Λ^{imm}: they vary in a locally constant fashion over the smooth part of Φ, and the exactness condition of §1.5.2 allows for a definition of $\mu_P(F)$ at the preimage of a multiple point of Φ as well. For example, on one of the two strands of the diagram (1.5.3), we have the microlocal stalks



which are canonically identified by the exactness of the square (1.5.3). The cones on the other pair of parallel arrows are likewise identified, giving the monodromy on the other strand.

Now we discuss the nature of microlocal monodromy near and *through* a singular point of a front. For example, if P and Q are on opposite sides of a fold, and F is the sheaf pictured in (1.5.4) then $\mu_P = \mathrm{Cone}(i)$ and $\mu_Q = \mathrm{Cone}(p)$ are related but not isomorphic: the homotopy between $p \circ i$ and 1_A gives an isomorphism between $\mathrm{Cone}(i)$ and $\Sigma^{-1}\mathrm{Cone}(p)$. As in a local system we think of this isomorphism as being induced by a path from P to Q passing through the fold, but it means that a closed loop that passes through several folds does not exactly induce an automorphism of the microlocal stalk at the base point. Instead, it induces a map

$$\mu_P \cong \mathbf{I} \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_P \tag{1.6.1}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is an invertible $\mathbf{k}$-module spectrum depending on the based loop.

The assignment from based loops to invertible $\mathbf{k}$-modules is similar to the data of a $\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbf{k})$-valued cocycle η on the fundamental group of L, and the data (1.6.1) is similar to the data of a module over the η-twisted group algebra. This resemblance is made precise in the theory of algebra structures on Thom spectra [ABGHR1], by keeping track of higher homotopies.

The critical D_4^- front, pictured on the right in §1.5.3, is one place such higher homotopies intervene. There, we have $\Lambda \cong \mathbf{R}^2$ and $\Lambda^{imm} \cong \mathbf{R}^2 - \{(0,0)\}$. A closed loop around the singular point (with an appropriate base point) induces the composite

$$B_1/A \xrightarrow{\sim} C/B_2 \xleftarrow{\sim} B_3/A \xrightarrow{\sim} C/B_1 \xleftarrow{\sim} B_2/A \xrightarrow{\sim} C/B_3 \xleftarrow{\sim} B_1/A \tag{1.6.2}$$

where the spectra are as in (1.5.4), and we write X/Y as a shorthand for $\mathrm{Cone}(Y \to X)$. The map (1.6.2) is always homotopic to -1.

Another formulation of the "cocycle" η is that it is the data of a locally constant sheaf of ∞-categories over Λ, the sheaf of Brane structures §1.4. Its global sections are in this sense η-twisted locals system — the ∞-category of them is equivalent to the ∞-category of the twisted group algebra. Then microlocal monodromy is a functor $\mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(M)$ to $\Gamma(\Lambda, \mathrm{Brane}_\Lambda)$, that we denote by $\mu\mathrm{mon}$. In this paper, we will not try to make this path-theoretic description of $\mu\mathrm{mon}$ precise. Instead, we construct Brane_Λ by Čech theory, and prove that it is locally constant using Kashiwara and Schapira's theory of contact transformations.

1.7. **The Nadler-Zaslow functor.** An exact Lagrangian in T^*M determines a conic Lagrangian in $T^*(M \times \mathbf{R})$, or equivalently a Legendrian in $(T^*M) \times \mathbf{R}$, which we denote by $\mathbf{L}$. The category of sheaves with singular support in $\mathbf{L}$ can be described as in §1.5, with Λ replaced by L and Φ replaced by the wavefront projection of L (which we sometimes denote by $\mathbf{F}$). Then L carries a locally constant sheaf of categories Brane_L, and §1.6 supplies a functor $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$. Guillermou has proved (in [Guil], with some superficial differences in language) that when L is compact and $L \to T^*M$ is an embedding, this functor restricts to an equivalence on the full subcategory $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ spanned by sheaves that vanish on $M \times (C, \infty)$ for $C \gg 0$.

We adapt this proof to the case where L is noncompact (and "lower exact" §3.2), and to treat sheaves of spectra. Then our version of (1.0.1) is given by the composite

$$\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \xleftarrow{\mu\mathrm{mon}} \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}} \mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(M) \tag{1.7.1}$$

1.8. **The J-homomorphism.** There is a universal locally constant sheaf of categories with fiber $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$, living above a space denoted $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})$. When $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{S}$ is the sphere spectrum $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})$ is an infinite loop space with

$$\pi_1(B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})) = \mathbf{Z} \qquad \pi_2(B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})) = \{\pm 1\} \qquad \pi_i(B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})) = \pi_{i-2}(\mathbf{S}) \quad \text{for } i \geq 3$$

Like any locally constant sheaf, the sheaf of brane structures is the pullback of this universal one along a classifying map $L \to B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})$. In a future paper, by studying a bundle over L whose fiber is a stabilization of the space of contact transformations, we will show that this map factors as

$$L \to \mathrm{LagGr}(\infty) \to B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S}) \tag{1.8.1}$$

where the first map is the stable Gauss map[2] and the second map (whose domain is U/O, one of the Bott spaces whose based loop space is naturally homotopy equivalent to $\mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O}$) is the delooping of the real J-homomorphism $\mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})$.

Since $\mathbf{S}$ is initial among ring spectra, there is a canonical map $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S}) \to B\mathrm{Pic}(R)$ for any commutative ring spectrum R, and we define an R-linear brane structure to be a trivialization of the composite map $L \to B\mathrm{Pic}(R)$. For some special values of R, the theory of genera and orientations [ABGHR2] shows that the composite $\mathrm{LagGr}(\infty) \to B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S}) \to B\mathrm{Pic}(R)$ factors in a canonical fashion through a quotient of the domain that has only finitely many homotopy groups. In these cases the vanishing of the Brane obstruction is implied by the vanishing of finitely many characteristic classes:

(1) For example, if R is discrete, then $J : \mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{Pic}(R)$ factors through $\mathbf{Z} \times B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{SO}) \cong \mathbf{Z} \times B(\mathbf{Z}/2)$. Thus the Brane obstruction can be trivialized by giving a null-homotopy of a map $L \to B\mathbf{Z} \times B^2(\mathbf{Z}/2)$ — this is the usual problem of gradings and relative pin structures.
(2) If $R = \mathbf{KU}$, then $J : \mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{Pic}(R)$ factors through a loop space we can denote by $\mathbf{Z}/2 \ltimes B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{Spin}^c)$, whose homotopy groups are $\mathbf{Z}/2, \mathbf{Z}/2, 0$, and $\mathbf{Z}$ in degrees 0–3 and vanish otherwise. (There is actually a splitting $\mathbf{Z}/2 \ltimes B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{Spin}^c) \cong \mathbf{Z}/2 \times B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{Spin}^c)$ preserving the loop space structure, but it is not canonical.)
(3) If $R = \mathbf{KO}$, then $J : \mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{Pic}(R)$ factors through a loop space we can denote by $\mathbf{Z}/8 \ltimes B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{Spin})$, whose homotopy groups are $\mathbf{Z}/8, \mathbf{Z}/2$, and $\mathbf{Z}/2$ in degrees 0–2 and vanish otherwise.
(4) If $R = \mathbf{tmf}$, $\mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O} \to \mathrm{Pic}(R)$ factors through $\mathbf{Z} \times B(\mathrm{O}/\mathrm{String})$, whose homotopy groups are $\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z}/2, \mathbf{Z}/2, 0$, and $\mathbf{Z}$ in degrees 0–4 and vanish otherwise.

In the nondiscrete cases to identify $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ with a category of untwisted local systems one might require less of the Maslov class (e.g. for $\mathbf{KU}$ it need only be even) but there are new classes that must be trivialized — in $H^4(L, \mathbf{Z})$, for $\mathbf{KU}$, in $H^3(L, \mathbf{Z}/2)$ for $\mathbf{KO}$, and in $H^3(L, \mathbf{Z}/2)$ and $H^5(L, \mathbf{Z})$ for $\mathbf{tmf}$.

1.9. **More general microlocal categories.** We briefly indicate some work in progress in this section. Lurie's preprint [Lu3] on circle actions and algebraic K-theory has a brief discussion explaining the topological obstructions to defining an $\mathbf{S}$-linear Fukaya category of a general symplectic manifold. In particular, he suggests that an $\mathbf{S}$-linear stable ∞-category can be associated to any symplectic $2n$-manifold for which the composite

$$M \to B\mathrm{U}(n) \to B\mathrm{U} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Bott}} B^2(\mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{U}) \xrightarrow{J_{\mathbb{C}}} B^2\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S}) \tag{1.9.1}$$

[2] e.g. [AbKr, §2], though in our case there is an involution of $\mathrm{LagGr}(\infty)$ that one needs to take.

is null-homotopic. The compatibility between the real and complex J-homomorphisms, and between the real and complex Bott periodicities, shows that when (1.9.1) is null-homotopic, each Lagrangian in M carries a locally constant sheaf of categories with fiber $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{S})$, which we may as well go on denoting Brane_L. When M is an exact Weinstein manifold, the data (1.9.1) determines a sheaf of categories over a skeleton of M, which is locally isomorphic to a category of sheaves — following Tamarkin, we may call it the "microlocal category" of M. The techniques of this paper can be extended to define a functor from $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ to this microlocal category.

1.10. **Precedents.** Microlocal sheaf theory was created by Kashiwara and Schapira [KaSc], and (1.7.1) is directly inspired by the work of Nadler and Zaslow [NaZa]. Our main result generalizes [Guil] on compact Lagrangians and our proof uses some of the same techniques. The most basic of these techniques, probing the symplectic geometry of T^*M by studying sheaves on $M \times \mathbf{R}$, was pioneered by Tamarkin [Tam1] and has many other recent applications. Here we indicate some influences and precedents that are less direct.

The algebraic-topological work required to assign gradings to Floer chain groups was first explained by Seidel [Seid]. The appearance of spectra in this paper is part of a tradition, maybe starting with Cohen-Jones-Segal [CJS], of pursuing a "Floer homotopy type" underlying Floer homology. The role in this story of locally constant sheaves of categories, whose fiber is the category of spectra, is anticipated in [Doug], and appear explicitly as Thom spectra in the Floer-theoretic works [Kr1, Kr2] and the non-Floer-theoretic work [AbKr]. Lurie's preprint [Lu3, §1.3] defines a topological invariant of an almost symplectic manifold, which he expects is the topological obstruction to defining a Fukaya category over the sphere spectrum — the fact that it vanishes for a cotangent bundle has inspired us.

1.11. **Questions.**

1.11.1. *Singular Lagrangians.* Suppose L is a singular Lagrangian (for simplicity, in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$) whose Lagrangian singularity type is locally constant along a smooth locus $L_0 \subset L$. Then one has a locally constant sheaf of categories along L_0 — the Kashiwara-Schapira sheaf $\mathrm{MSh}_L|_{L_0}$. Does this sheaf of categories have any familiar description in algebraic topology, along the lines of the J-homomorphism in the case of a smooth L?

1.11.2. *Immersed Lagrangians.* If $L \to T^*M$ is an exact Lagrangian immersion, we can still make sense of the diagram (1.7.1), but the left-hand map is no longer an equivalence. It does have a right adjoint, and one could in this way compose $\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}$ with this adjoint to obtain a functor from twisted local systems on L to $\mathrm{Sh}(M)$. More intriguingly, one could regard (1.7.1) as a correspondence or multiple-valued functor — in the case where L and M are circles, this correspondence is studied in [STZ, §6], it is shown to be closely related to the HOMFLY homology of the Legendrian lift of $L \subset (T^*S^1) \times \mathbf{R} \subset S^3$.

Neither recipe matches the standard Floer-theoretic treatments of immersed Lagrangians in any obvious way. What's going on?

1.11.3. *Holomorphic Lagrangians.* Holomorphic Lagrangians are never lower exact, so one cannot apply (1.7.1) to them directly. Still, let us indicate an interesting feature of the J-homomorphism in the holomorphic symplectic setting. Suppose (as in [J1]) that L is a holomorphic Lagrangian in the cotangent bundle of a complex manifold M. Then the Gauss map $L \to \mathrm{U}/\mathrm{O}$ factors through Sp/U. This greatly simplifies the problem of trivializing Brane_L — for example, after inverting 2 in $\mathbf{S}$ it can be shown that Brane_L is always trivializable. After [J1] it is tempting to call a sheaf of spectra on M that arises

from a holomorphic Lagrangian "perverse," although such "perverse sheaves of spectra" cannot live in the heart of any t-structure on $\mathrm{Sh}(M, \mathbf{S})$.

It is interesting to speculate if there is a deeper implication. The target of the holomorphic Gauss map is a further delooping of U/O, and we can compose it with a further delooping of the J-homomorphism:

$$L_{\mathbf{C}} \to \mathrm{Sp}/\mathrm{U} \to B^2\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{S})$$

This suggests that $L_{\mathbf{C}}$ carries a sheaf of 2-categories — is there anything to that? Can our recipe be adapted to produce some kind of 2-categorical sheaf-like object on M? The "categorified nature" of holomorphic symplectic geometry compared to real symplectic geometry is a well-known phenomenon in quantum field theory, see especially [KaRo]. Perhaps a perverse schober?

Note this line of speculation can be continued up Bott's tower — e.g. as the quadruple delooping of $\mathbf{Z} \times B\mathrm{O}$ is the stable quaternionic Grassmannian, each almost quaternionic manifold carries a locally constant sheaf of 4-categories.

1.11.4. *Lagrangian cobordisms.* Nadler and Tanaka [NaTa] consider ∞-categories of exact Lagrangians and cobordisms between them. These ∞-categories are stable (for nontrivial reasons), and in fact are linear over a symmetric monoidal "coefficient" category called $\mathrm{Lag}_{pt}(pt)$. [NaTa] leaves open the problem of identifying this coefficient category. It is defined as a colimit of unstable categories

$$\mathrm{Lag}_{pt}(pt) := \varinjlim_n \mathrm{Lag}^{\diamond 0}_{\mathbf{R}^n}(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$$

whose objects (resp. morphisms) are exact Lagrangian submanifolds of $T^*\mathbf{R}^n$ (resp. $T^*\mathbf{R}^n \times T^*\mathbf{R}$). The morphisms are subject to a condition in the $T^*\mathbf{R}$-factor, called "noncharacteristic" or "$\mathbf{R}^n$-avoiding", that makes them irreversible.

As part of the definition, all of these Lagrangians (objects, cobordisms, and higher morphisms) are equipped with a trivialization of the composite of the Gauss map with $\mathrm{LagGr} \to S^1 \times B^2(\mathbf{Z}/2) \cong B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{Z})$ — but not with a local system. Still, we recognize the map to be trivialized as Brane_L with $\mathbf{Z}$-coefficients, thus (if we stick to lower exact Lagrangians) our results associate

(1) functors $\mathrm{Loc}(L; \mathbf{Z}) \to \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbf{R}^n; \mathbf{Z})$ to objects of $\mathrm{Lag}^{\diamond 0}_{\mathbf{R}^n}(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$
(2) functors $\mathrm{Loc}(C; \mathbf{Z}) \to \mathrm{Sh}(\mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}; \mathbf{Z})$ to morphisms of $\mathrm{Lag}^{\diamond 0}_{\mathbf{R}^n}(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$. (The noncharacteristicness condition forces the image of this functor to lie in a certain localization of $\mathrm{Sh}(\mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R})$.)

and so on for higher morphisms. What is the right way to organize this structure?

1.12. **Acknowledgments.** We have benefited from answers, advice, and conversations on this topic from Mohammed Abouzaid, Elden Elmento, Marc Hoyois, Jacob Lurie, Akhil Mathew, Haynes Miller, David Nadler, Dmitri Pavlov, Dima Tamarkin, and Dylan Wilson. DT was supported by NSF-DMS-1510444 and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

2. Sheaves of spectra

In this section we review the microlocal theory of sheaves on manifolds, noting what requires care in an ∞-categorical setting. Even when working over a discrete ring $\mathbf{k}$, we depart somewhat from [KaSc], in that we do not impose boundedness conditions. In ∞-categorical jargon all of our ∞-categories of sheaves are "presentable."

It is an old observation of Neeman that working systematically with unbounded categories can simplify certain arguments in triangulated categories, but for many years it was

not possible to take advantage of this observation in the kind of sheaf theory we discuss here — most strikingly, we believe that in 1990 when [KaSc] was being written it was an open problem whether the proper base-change theorem holds for unbounded complexes, even for a pair of maps between finite-dimensional manifolds. This was settled by Lurie in [Lu1] (announced earlier in [Lu4]).

Our interest is in Lagrangian submanifolds in cotangent bundles in T^*M, which are related to constructible sheaves on M and (as we begin to discuss in §3) $M \times \mathbf{R}$. In [KaSc] it is shown that systematic study of non-constructible sheaves can simplify the study of constructible sheaves, in particular Kashiwara and Schapira do not require the use of stratified Morse theory. But there are crucial tools in approach that are difficult to import to the presentable setting. The problem is that specialization to the normal cone, and functors derived from it, such as $\mu\mathrm{hom}$, commute with neither infinite colimits nor infinite limits. So in our microlocal analysis of sheaves of spectra, we restrict to sheaves that are constructible on a Whitney stratification and use stratified Morse theory.

Nevertheless, the microlocal theory of nonconstructible sheaves may be important in symplectic geometry, as it is the basis of Tamarkin's microlocal category of a compact symplectic manifold [Tam2]. It will be necessary to develop a theory for sheaves of spectra. We take some first steps in §2.7–§2.8; there is also recent work of Robalo and Schapira along these lines [RoSc].

2.1. **Coefficients and stable ∞-categories.** We will use Σ for the suspension functor in a stable ∞-category. If $\mathbf{k}$ is an associative algebra spectrum, we write $\mathrm{LMod}(\mathbf{k})$ for its ∞-category of left module spectra — it is a compactly generated presentable stable ∞-category. When $\mathbf{k}$ is a discrete ring, $\mathrm{LMod}(\mathbf{k})$ is an ∞-categorical enrichment of the usual unbounded derived category of $\mathbf{k}$-modules.

If $\mathbf{k}$ has the structure of an E_2-algebra, then $\mathrm{LMod}(\mathbf{k})$ has a monoidal structure $(- \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} -)$ that preserves colimits in both variables. In this case we will shorten our notation for this monoidal stable ∞-category to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$.

We write St for the symmetric monoidal ∞-category of presentable stable ∞-categories, and continuous (colimit-preserving) functors. We write $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for the ∞-category of left $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$-module objects in St. We write $\mathbf{S}$ for the sphere spectrum, which has canonically $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{S}} \cong \mathrm{St}$.

We write $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})^{\simeq}$ for the full subcategory of $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ of objects that are equivalent to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$, and $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k}) \subset B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})^{\simeq}$ for the subcategory obtained by discarding non-invertible morphisms in $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})^{\simeq}$. Thus $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})$ is an ∞-groupoid; we will usually regard it as a space, i.e. abuse notation and not distinguish between this ∞-groupoid and its nerve. The meaning of the notation is that there is a canonical homotopy equivalence between the space of based loops in $B\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})$ (with basepoint at $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$) with the space of $\otimes$-invertible objects of $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$, the latter space is denoted $\mathrm{Pic}(\mathbf{k})$.

2.2. **Sheaves and sheaf operations.** We write $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for the ∞-category of sheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-module spectra on a locally compact Hausdorff space X. Formally, if $\mathrm{Shv}(X)$ denotes the ∞-topos associated to X [Lu1, §6.5.4], then $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ is the ∞-category of contravariant functors $\mathrm{Shv}(X)^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ that convert small colimits into small limits. (In [Lu1, Notation 6.3.5.16], this is $\mathrm{Shv}_{\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})}(X)$.)

2.2.1. *Covers.* One may also obtain $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ as a localization §2.6 of the category of $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$-valued presheaves on X. As we are assuming X is locally compact, it is the full subcategory of presheaves P that obey any of the following equivalent conditions:

(1) Let U be an open subset of X and let $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ be an open cover of U. Let $\mathcal{U}$ denote the poset of open subsets of U that are contained in at least one of the U_i. Then the natural map
$$P(U) \to \varprojlim_{V\in\mathcal{U}} P(V)$$
assembled from the restriction maps $P(U) \to P(V)$ is an isomorphism.

(2) Let U be an open subset of X, and let $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ be a open cover of U that is closed under finite intersections — that is, suppose that for each i, j, there is a k such that $U_i \cap U_j = U_k$. (We will follow [DI, Def 4.5] and call such a covering a "Čech cover.") Regarding I as a poset and $i \mapsto U_i \mapsto P(U_i)$ as a functor on this poset, the natural map
$$P(U) \to \varprojlim_{i\in I} P(U_i)$$
assembled from the restriction maps $P(U) \to P(U_i)$ is an isomorphism.

(3) Let U be an open subset of X, and let $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ be an open cover of U that has the following hypercovering property: every finite intersection $U_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap U_{i_n}$ can be covered by open subsets from $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$. (We will follow [DI, Def. 4.5] and call a covering of U with this property a "complete cover."). Then regarding $\mathcal{U}$ as a poset, the natural map
$$P(U) \to \varprojlim_{i\in I} P(U_i)$$
is an isomorphism.

2.2.2. *Locally constant sheaves, operations.* One defines the constant sheaf with fiber $M \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ to be the sheafification of the presheaf that takes the constant value M, and call a sheaf locally constant if it is isomorphic to such a constant sheaf in some open cover of M. We write $\mathrm{Loc}(X, \mathbf{k}) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ for the full subcategory of locally constant sheaves on X.

When X is locally contractible, a necessary and sufficient condition for F to be locally constant is for each there to exist a complete covering (in the sense of §2.2.1(3)) by contractible open subsets $U_i \subset X$, such that $F(U_i) \to F(U_j)$ is an isomorphism whenever $U_j \subset U_i$. In fact if $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ is such a covering then $\mathrm{Loc}(X, \mathbf{k})$ is equivalent to the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Fun}(I^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}))$ spanned by functors that carry every arrow in I^{op} to an equivalence. (Let us call functors with this property "locally constant functors.")

If $f : Y \to X$ is a continuous map, the pullback functor $f^* : \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y)$ is a continuous functor, with a right adjoint f_* that is not always continuous. If $f = j$ is an open embedding then j^* (which in the case of an open embedding we also denote by $j^!$) has a left adjoint $j_!$, the extension-by-zero functor. As it is a left adjoint, it is automatically continuous.

If f is a proper continuous map between locally compact spaces, then f_* (which in the case of a proper map we also denote by $f_!$) is continuous. For a general map between locally compact spaces, we define $f_! = \overline{f}_* \circ j_!$, where $j, \overline{f}$ is a factorization into an open inclusion j and a proper map $\overline{f}$.

2.2.3. *Deligne gluing.* Let LCHS be the 1-category of locally compact Hausdorff spaces and continuous maps. It is straightforward to verify that there is a functor $\mathrm{LCHS}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$, carrying X to $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ and f to f^*. It is more difficult to verify that there is a functor $\mathrm{LCHS} \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ carrying X to $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X; \mathbf{k})$ and f to $f_!$ — this is again straightforward for either the subcategory of LCHS whose morphisms are proper maps, or that whose

morphisms are open inclusions, but to glue these requires an ∞-categorical update to the machine in [Del] — this is carried out in great generality in [LiZh1, Cor. 0.2], [LiZh2, §2.2].

2.2.4. *Cosheaf perspective.* If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then for each open $U \subset X$, the functor $F \mapsto \Gamma_c(U, F)$ is continuous, as it is the composite of restriction to U and proper pushforward to a point. In contrast, the functor $F \mapsto \Gamma(U, F)$ is not usually continuous (for example if U contains a closed, infinite discrete set Z, then the constant sheaf on Z is a direct sum, while its image under $\Gamma(U, -)$ is a direct product). Note that $\Gamma_c(U, F)$ is covariant in the U-variable — it is a cosheaf in the sense that, whenever $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a family of open subsets that is closed under finite intersections and that covers U, the natural map

$$\varinjlim_{i\in I} \Gamma_c(U_i; F) \to \Gamma_c(U; F)$$

is an isomorphism.

In [Tam2], Tamarkin uses such cosheaves systematically — but he calls them sheaves. Indeed on a locally compact Hausdorff space, the ∞-categories of sheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-modules and of cosheaves of $\mathbf{k}$-modules are equivalent, via the assignment $F \mapsto \Gamma_c(-; F)$. This is one formulation of Verdier duality.

2.2.5. *Descent.* When regarded as a $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$-valued contravariant functor on LCHS, the ∞-categories $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(-; \mathbf{k})$ themselves form a sheaf, so that whenever $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ is an open cover of X, the restriction maps $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X; \mathbf{k}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U_i; \mathbf{k})$ assemble to an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X; \mathbf{k}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \varprojlim_{i\in I} \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U_i; \mathbf{k})$$

where the limit is taken in the ∞-category $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$. The same is true with $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(-, \mathbf{k})$ replaced by $\mathrm{Loc}(-, \mathbf{k})$, or by the categories $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}}(-; \mathbf{k})$ and $\mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda}(-; \mathbf{k})$ discussed in §2.9.

2.3. **Generators.** In classic sheaf theory texts, many identities between sheaf operations are verified by taking suitable resolutions (injective, flabby, soft,...). The theory of presentable categories gives an alternative which is more general (as it applies to unbounded complexes, or to sheaves of spectra), and in some ways simpler.

The sheaves of the form $j_{U,!}\mathbf{k}$, where $j_U : U \hookrightarrow X$ runs though all open subsets of X, make a small set of generators for $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ — indeed, $j_{U,!}\mathbf{k}$ represents the sections functor $F \mapsto \Gamma(U; F)$. We may use this to verify sheaf operation identities by the following device: if ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are continuous functors $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X) \to \mathcal{C}$ in $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$, and $n : \phi_1 \to \phi_2$ is a natural transformation between them (i.e. n is a morphism in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X), \mathcal{C})$), then n is an isomorphism if and only if $n_U : \phi_1(j_{U,!}\mathbf{k}) \to \phi_2(j_{U,!}\mathbf{k})$ is an isomorphism for all U.

(We warn once again, however, that the objects $j_{U,!}\mathbf{k}$ are not usually compact — they are $\aleph_1$-compact in the sense of [Lu1, §5.3.4])

2.4. **Proper base change.** We record a consequence of the nonabelian proper base change theorem of [Lu1, §7.3]. Given a Cartesian diagram of locally compact topological spaces,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \xrightarrow{q'} & X \\ {\scriptstyle p'}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} \\ Y' & \xrightarrow[q]{} & Y \end{array}$$

the natural map $q^* p_! \to p'_! q'^*$ is an isomorphism of functors $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y')$.

There is an expectation, which has been seen through in other contexts [GaRo], that "six operations" formalisms can be encoded in $(\infty,2)$-categorical language — as a functor from the $(2,2)$-category of spaces, correspondences, and correspondences-between-correspondences, to the $(\infty,2)$-category of categories. We don't use it in this paper.

2.5. **Monoidal structure and functors from kernels.** The monoidal structure on $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ induces a monoidal structure on $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X,\mathbf{k})$, which we also denote by $(-\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}-)$. Formally, one applies [Lu2, Lemma 2.2.1.9] to the monoidal category of presheaves on X, after noting that if $P\to P'$ induces an equivalence after sheafification, then so does $P\otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Q\to P'\otimes_{\mathbf{k}} Q$. The pullback functors f^* are monoidal.

For each $K\in\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X\times Y;\mathbf{k})$, we define a continuous functor $K\circ:\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y)\to\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X)$, by the formula

$$G\mapsto \mathrm{proj}_{1,!}\left(K\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}\mathrm{proj}_2^*G\right)$$

(In the notation of [KaSc, Def. 3.6.1], this is Φ_K). We also define $\circ K:\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y)\to\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X)$ (denoted $F\mapsto F\circ K$) by $G\mapsto \mathrm{proj}_{1,!}\left(\mathrm{proj}_2^*G\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}K\right)$. Unless $\mathbf{k}$ is E_3-commutative or better, we do not usually have a natural isomorphism $K\circ F\cong F\circ K$.

2.5.1. *Projection formula.* There is a "projection formula" (as in [KaSc, Prop. 2.6.6]), i.e. natural isomorphisms

$$f_!G\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}F\cong f_!(G\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}f^*F)\qquad F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}f_!G\cong f_!(f^*F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}G) \tag{2.5.1}$$

From (2.5.1) and the adjunction between $f_!$ and $f^!$, one can construct (exactly as in [KaSc, Prop. 3.1.11]) natural transformations

$$f^!F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}f^*G\to f^!(F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}G)\qquad f^*F\otimes f^!G\to f^!(F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}G)$$

If $f:Y\to X$ is a fiber bundle whose fiber is a topological manifold, or more generally a topological submersion in the sense of [KaSc, Def. 3.3.1], these become isomorphisms. In particular, putting $\omega_{Y/X}:=f^!(\mathbf{k})$, we have canonically

$$f^!F\cong f^*F\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}\omega_{Y/X}\cong\omega_{Y/X}\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}f^*F \tag{2.5.2}$$

when f is a topological submersion — the proof is the same as [KaSc, Prop. 3.3.2(ii)]. Moreover $\omega_{Y/X}$ is invertible, it is locally isomorphic to a suspension of the constant sheaf on Y. Note that (2.5.2) implies that, for a topological submersion, $f^!$ is a continuous functor.

The equation (2.5.2) also holds when f is a fiber bundle whose fiber is a manifold with boundary. In that case the restriction of f to the complement of the boundary (write it as Y°) is a topological submersion, and $\omega_{Y/X}$ is the extension by zero of $\omega_{Y^\circ/X}$ along the inclusion $Y^\circ\to Y$.

2.5.2. *The kernel K^{-1}.* If $\Delta_X:X\to X\times X$ denotes the diagonal embedding, then $(\Delta_{X,*}\mathbf{k})\circ$ and $\circ(\Delta_{X,*}\mathbf{k})$ are both isomorphic to the identity functor on $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X)$. Given a kernel $K\in\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X\times Y)$, there is another kernel $K^{-1}\in\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y\times X)$ along with a natural map $K^{-1}\circ K\to\Delta_{X,*}\mathbf{k}$ — it is given by the formula [GKS, Eq. 1.21]

$$K^{-1}=\mathrm{flip}(\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(K,\omega_{X\times Y/Y})) \tag{2.5.3}$$

where $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(K,-)$ is the right adjoint functor to $K\otimes_{\mathbf{k}}(-)$, $\omega_{X\times Y/Y}\cong\omega_X\boxtimes\mathbf{k}_Y$ as in §2.5.1, and flip is the obvious equivalence between $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X\times Y)$ and $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(Y\times X)$.

2.6. **Localization.** If C is a presentable ∞-category, the following data are equivalent to each other [Lu1, Prop. 5.2.7.4]:

(1) Another presentable ∞-category LC together with a continuous functor $C \to LC$ whose right adjoint is fully faithful.
(2) A not necessarily continuous functor $L : C \to C$, together with a natural transformation $\eta_L : 1_C \to L$ that becomes an isomorphism after applying L — i.e. that has $L(\eta_L) : L \to L^2$ an isomorphism.

When C is stable, these data are furthermore equivalent to

(3) A *localizing subcategory* of C, i.e. a full subcategory $C' \subset C$ that is closed under infinite direct sums, and that is also presentable.

(We warn that some authors do not require that a "localizing subcategory" is presentable, though there is a strong set-theoretic axiom (Vopenka's principle) which implies that presentability of C' is automatic.)

(1) determines (2) by taking $L : C \to C$ to be the composite of $C \to LC$ with its right adjoint. (2) determines (1) by taking LC to be the essential image of L. In the stable setting (1) and (2) determine (3) by taking C' to be the kernel of L.

If $C' \subset C$ is a localizing subcategory of a presentable stable ∞-category, we sometimes write C/C' or $L_{C'}C$ for the right orthogonal of C' in C, i.e. for full subcategory of C spanned by objects c with $\mathrm{Hom}(c', c) = 0$ for all $c' \in C'$. This is how (3) determines (1) — the fully faithful inclusion $C/C' \to C$ has a left adjoint $C \to C/C'$.

A $\mathbf{k}$-linear structure on C that preserves C' induces a $\mathbf{k}$-linear structure on C/C', and the construction $(C' \subset C) \mapsto C/C'$ is functorial. In fact it extends to a functor

$$\mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}) \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}} \tag{2.6.1}$$

taking the arrow $C \to C'$ to the colimit of the diagram $0 \leftarrow C' \to C$.

A basic example is the case of restriction to an open subset. That is, if C is the ∞-category of sheaves on a space and LC is the ∞-category of sheaves on an open subset, then the restriction functor $j^* : C \to LC$ has a fully faithful right adjoint j_*, and $L = j_*j^*$. Another example is discussed in the next section §2.7.2.

2.7. **Microlocal theory of non-constructible sheaves.** In a moment, we will restrict our attention to sheaves that are locally constant on the strata of some Whitney stratification, and study them with the help of stratified Morse theory. But Kashiwara and Schapira give tools for analyzing more general sheaves microlocally. We discuss some of these tools in this section from the standpoint of sheaves of spectra. This material is "optional" (it is not used elsewhere in this paper) so we will be somewhat terse.

2.7.1. *Singular support.* The singular support $SS(F) \subset T^*X$ of a sheaf $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ is defined by defining its complement. We say that $(x, \xi) \notin SS(F)$ if the following conditions holds for some neighborhood $U \ni (x, \xi)$:

> If ψ is a real-valued C^1-function, defined in a neighborhood of x_1 and with $d\psi_{x_1} \in U$, then

$$(\Gamma_{\{x|\psi(x)\geq\psi(x_1)\}}(F))_{x_1} = 0 \tag{2.7.1}$$

Here the notation Γ_Y denotes the composite sheaf operation $(Y \hookrightarrow X)_! \circ (Y \hookrightarrow X)^!$. The stalk of $\Gamma_{\{x|\psi(x)\geq\psi(x_1)\}}(F)$ at x_1 depends only on the germ of ψ near x_1.

This definition makes clear that $SS(F)$ is a closed subset of T^*X, and that it is functorial for pullback by C^1-homeomorphisms. Other desirable properties are not immediate, and need a second look in the setting of unbounded complexes or spectra. In particular,

since Γ_Y is not a continuous functor, it is not immediate that if one is given infinitely many sheaves with $SS(F_i) \subset Z$, then one also has $SS(\bigoplus F_i) \subset Z$.

2.7.2. *"γ-topology"*. Suppose E is a real vector space, and $\gamma \subset E$ is a proper convex cone — i.e. a set that is closed under addition and nonnegative scalars, and for which the addition map $\gamma^{\times 2} \to \gamma$ is proper. Kashiwara and Schapira consider a coarse topology on E called the γ-topology, written E_γ for which the identity map $\phi_\gamma : E \to E_\gamma$ is continuous. The pushforward functor $\phi_{\gamma,*}$ plays a key technical role in some of their arguments, but as $\phi_{\gamma,*}$ does not preserve colimits we cannot directly apply it in the setting of sheaves of unbounded complexes or of spectra. In this section we describe an alternative functor L_γ, which is a localization is the sense of §2.6.

Let $(\gamma^\vee)^\circ$ be the interior of its polar cone, i.e.

$$(\gamma^\vee)^\circ = \{\xi \in E^* \mid \langle \xi, x\rangle > 0 \text{ for } x \in \gamma - \{0\}\}$$

As γ is proper, $(\gamma^\vee)^\circ$ is open and nonempty. We define an endofunctor $L_\gamma : \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E, \mathbf{k}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E, \mathbf{k})$ as follows: if $p, a : E \times \gamma$ are given by $p(x, y) = x$ and $a(x, y) = x + y$, then $L_\gamma F := a_* p^! F$. The closed inclusion $i : E = E \times \{0\} \hookrightarrow E \times \gamma$ splits both p and a, so we define a natural transformation $\eta : F \to L_\gamma F$ as the composite

$$F \cong (a \circ i)_*(p \circ i)^! F \cong a_* i_! i^! p^! F \to a_* p^! F$$

where the last map is induced by the adjunction $i_! i^! \to 1$. It follows from the proper base-change theorem and the contractibility of the fibers of $\gamma^{\times 2} \to \gamma$ that $\eta : L_\gamma F \to L_\gamma L_\gamma F$ is an isomorphism.

2.7.3. *Noncharacteristic deformation lemma.* This is the name given to [KaSc, Prop. 2.7.2]. The "unbounded" analog is the following:

Proposition. Let X be a Hausdorff space and $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ a sheaf on X. Suppose that $\{U_t\}_{t \in \mathbf{R}}$ is a family of open subsets of X obeying the following:

(1) $U_t = \bigcup_{s<t} U_s$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$
(2) Whenever $t \geq s$, the set $\overline{U_t - U_s} \cap \mathrm{supp}(F)$ is compact
(3) Setting $Z_s = \bigcap_{t>s} \overline{U_t - U_s}$, whenever $s \leq t$ and $x \in Z_s - U_t$:

(2.7.2) $(\Gamma_{X-U_t} F)_x = 0$ (i.e. $((X - U_t)_!(X - U_t)^! F)_x = 0$, notation from §2.7.1)

Then for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$, the natural map is an isomorphism:

$$\Gamma\left(\bigcup_s U_s; F\right) \to \Gamma(U_t; F)$$

Proof. As in [KaSc, Prop 2.7.2], the proof is an application of the following:

> **Kashiwara lemma:** Let $P : \mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ be a presheaf on the poset $\mathbf{R}$. Suppose that for each $s \in \mathbf{R}$, the maps
>
> $$\varinjlim_{t>s} P(t) \to P(s) \qquad P(s) \to \varprojlim_{t<s} P(t)$$
>
> are both isomorphisms. Then $P(s_1) \to P(s_2)$ is an isomorphism for every $s_1 \geq s_2$.

When $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{Z}$ and under some boundedness hypotheses, a version of this first appeared in the proof of [Kash, Th. 1.2]. We learned the following proof (which does not require such hypotheses) from Dmitri Pavlov — perhaps it is the same proof that Kashiwara ommited for [Kash, Lem. 1.3]. For each $s_2 \leq t \leq s_1$, let $C(t)$ denote the cone on $P(s_1) \to P(t)$.

Fix a map $f : \Sigma^k \mathbf{k} \to C(s_2)$. We will show that f is nullhomotopic, by showing that f factors through $C(s_1) = 0$. As $C(s_2) = \varinjlim_{t > s_2} C(t)$ and $\Sigma^k \mathbf{k}$ is compact in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$, the map f factors through $C(t)$ for some $t > s_2$. Let r be the supremum of all $t \leq s_1$ for which such a factorization can be found. As $C(r) = \varprojlim_{t<r} C(t)$, it follows that a factorization through $C(r)$ can be found. But then we must have $r = s_1$, for if this is false then (using $C(r) = \varinjlim_{t>r} C(t)$) we may find $t > r$ such that f factors through $C(t)$, violating the definition of r. □

2.7.4. *Singular support in a coordinate patch.* The following proposition implies that, given infinitely many sheaves F_i with $SS(F_i) \subset Z$, one has $SS(\bigoplus F_i) \subset Z$ as well. It is an analog of [KaSc, Prop. 5.1.1], and is proved in a similar way — though in our formulation we must replace the functor $\phi_{\gamma,*}$ used in [KaSc] by L_γ §2.7.2.

Proposition. Let E be a finite-dimensional real vector space and let X be an open subset of E. Let $p = (x_\circ, \xi_\circ) \in T^*X$ and let $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$. Then the following conditions are equivalent, where $1 \leq \alpha \leq \infty$ or $\alpha = \omega$

- $(1)_\alpha$ There is an open neighborhood $U \ni p$ such that for any $x_1 \in X$ and any real function ψ of class C^α defined in a neighborhood of x_1, with $\psi(x_1) = 0$, $d\psi(x_1) \in U$,
$$(\Gamma_{\{x | \psi(x) \geq \psi(x_1)\}}(F))_{x_1} = 0$$
where the notation $\Gamma_Y F$ is the same as in (2.7.1).
- (2) There is a proper closed convex cone $\gamma \subset E$ and an $F' \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E, \mathbf{k})$ such that $-\xi_\circ \in (\gamma^\vee)^\circ$, $F'|_U \cong F|_U$ for some neighborhood U of x, and $L_\gamma F' = 0$.

The proof is a somewhat lengthy modification of the proof of [KaSc, Prop 5.1.1].

2.8. **The sheaf of microlocal sheaves.** This is another "optional" section, describing an approach to constructing sheaves of brane structures, or more general microlocal categories, that we will not work out in detail.

For each conic subset $U \subset T^*M$, Kashiwara and Schapira introduce a category of "microlocal sheaves on U," called $D^b(M, U)$. It is defined to be the Verdier quotient of the bounded derived category of sheaves on M by the subcategory of sheaves with singular support outside of U. When U is open[3] we make a similar definition, using ∞-categorical localization §2.6 in place of the Verdier quotient. More precisely we define $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, U)$ to be the right orthogonal to the full subcategory of sheaves whose singular support is in the complement of U.

2.8.1. *The presheaf of microlocal sheaves.* The assignment $U \mapsto \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, U)$ from conic open subsets of T^*M to full subcategories of $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M)$ is inclusion-preserving. Each of the inclusions $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, V)$ has a continuous left adjoint, and by [Lu1, Cor. 5.5.3.4], the left adjoints to these left adjoints assemble to a contravariant functor from the poset of conic open subsets of T^*M to $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$, i.e. to a presheaf on T^*M that as in [TZ, §3.1] we denote by $\mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}$.

The equality $SS(F) \cap U = SS(F') \cap U$ holds whenever F and F' become isomorphisms in $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, U)$ — this follows from the triangle inequalities. Given a closed conic subset $Z \subset T^*M$, we define $\mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z$ to be the presheaf on T^*M by

$$\Gamma(U, \mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z) = \{F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, U) \mid SS(F) \cap U \subset Z\}$$

[3] If U is not open, the class of sheaves with singular support in the complement of U is not closed under infinite direct sums

This presheaf is supported on Z in the sense that its sections over any open set in the complement of Z give the zero category.

2.8.2. *Sheafification of the presheaf of microlocal sheaves.* We write MSh_Z for the sheafification of $\mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z$. Let us first make a warning about sheafification, that makes it difficult to identify MSh_Z in general. The ∞-category $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is not compactly generated. Because of this, it is not possible to tell whether a morphism between sheaves of categories is an equivalence, by checking that it is an equivalence on stalks.

For example as U runs through the open subsets of the real line $\mathbf{R}$, the ∞-categories $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U)$ and their full subcategories $\mathrm{Loc}(U)$ assemble to sheaves of presentable stable ∞-categories, let us denote them by Loc and Sh_{all}. It follows from [Lu1, Thm. 5.5.3.18] that the inclusion functor $\mathrm{Loc} \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}$ induces an equivalence of stalks.

However when Z is a conic Lagrangian contained in the conormal variety of some Whitney stratification, $\mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z$ has the following constructibility property:

- the presheaf is constructible along Z in the sense that every point has a fundamental system of neighborhoods $z \in Z$ for which the restriction maps $\Gamma(U_i, \mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z) \to \Gamma(U_j, \mathrm{MSh}^{\mathrm{p}}_Z)$ are equivalences.

This property is inherited by MSh_Z. When $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ are sheaves of ∞-categories obeying such a constructibility property, we have a stalkwise criterion for equivalences. For example it follows that MSh_Z is locally constant over the complement of some codimension 1 set in Z.

2.9. **Constructible sheaves.** Write $\mathrm{Loc}(X, \mathbf{k}) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ for the full subcategory of locally constant sheaves. If X is a smooth manifold and $\mathcal{S}$ is a Whitney stratification of X, we say that $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ is $\mathcal{S}$-quasiconstructible if its restriction to each stratum is locally constant. We say that F is $\mathcal{S}$-constructible if furthermore its stalk at each point is a perfect $\mathbf{k}$-module (i.e. a compact object of $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$). The full subcategory of $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(X, \mathbf{k})$ spanned by the $\mathcal{S}$-quasiconstructible sheaves is closed under small colimits — in particular it is an object of $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ that we denote by $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}}(X, \mathbf{k})$.

We warn that it is not usually the case that $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}}(X, \mathbf{k})$ is generated under colimits by the $\mathcal{S}$-constructible sheaves — this is not even true for locally constant sheaves. However it is true when $\mathcal{S}$ is a regular cell complex.

2.9.1. *Operations.* Suppose X and Y are stratified manifolds with stratifications $\mathcal{S}_X$ and $\mathcal{S}_Y$. We say that $f : X \to Y$ is a stratified mapping if there is a factorization $X \to \overline{X} \to Y$, and a stratification of $\overline{X}$, such that $X \to \overline{X}$ is the inclusion of an open union of strata and $\overline{X} \to Y$ is proper and restricts to a submersion on each stratum. If f is a stratified mapping then f^*, f_*, $f_!$ and $f^!$ preserve the subcategories of $\mathcal{S}$-quasiconstructible sheaves. Moreover, $f_* : \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}_X}(X; \mathbf{k}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}_Y}(Y; \mathbf{k})$ is continuous.

2.9.2. *Microlocal stalks.* If X is a manifold and $\mathcal{S}$ is a Whitney stratification of X, let $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}} \subset T^*X$ denote its conormal variety

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}} := \bigcup_{S_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}} T^*_{S_\alpha} X \tag{2.9.1}$$

Let $\Lambda^{sm}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the smooth part. For every $(x, \xi) \in \Lambda^{sm}_{\mathcal{S}}$, the microlocal stalk functor $\mu_{x,\xi} : \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}}(X) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ is defined by

$$\mu_{x,\xi}(F) := \Sigma^d \mathrm{Cone}\left(\Gamma_c(B_\epsilon(x) \cap \upsilon^{-1}(\eta, \infty), F) \to \Gamma_c(B_\epsilon(x), F)\right) \tag{2.9.2}$$

where υ is an $\mathcal{S}$-stratified Morse function defined in a neighborhood $B_\epsilon(x)$ of x, with $d\upsilon_x = \xi$, d is the index of υ at x, and $0 < \eta \ll \epsilon$ are sufficiently small (in the sense that

(η, ϵ) belongs to a fringed set [GMac, §5]). The ball $B_\epsilon(x)$ is defined with respect to a Riemannian metric on X. The "the stratified Morse theorem, part B" of [GMac] implies that this functor is well-defined up to isomorphism — independent of the metric and of υ, ϵ, η. For any positive real r we have canonically $\mu_{x,r\xi}F \cong \mu_{x,\xi}$. The functor $\mu_{x,\xi}$ is sensitive to the stratification only in the sense that if $\mathcal{S}'$ refines $\mathcal{S}$, the functor $\mu_{x,\xi}$ may not be defined on $\mathcal{S}'$-constructible sheaves if (x,ξ) is not a smooth point of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}'}$ (equivalently, if the $\mathcal{S}'$-stratum containing x is of lower dimension than the $\mathcal{S}$-stratum containing x).

2.9.3. *Singular support.* For constructible sheaves, the notion of singular support §2.7.1 specializes to the following. If $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the closure of a union of components of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}^{sm}$, we write $\mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(X)$ for the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathcal{S}}(X)$ spanned by sheaves F that obey the condition:

$$\mu_{x,\xi}(F) = 0 \text{ whenever } (x,\xi) \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{S}} - \Lambda \tag{2.9.3}$$

The category $\mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(X)$ is independent of the stratification $\mathcal{S}$ with $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}} \supset \Lambda$. If $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(X)$, then we say that the singular support of F is contained in Λ, and write $SS(F) \subset \Lambda$. As $\mu_{x,\xi}$ is continuous, $\mathrm{Sh}_\Lambda(X) \in \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is presentable.

Kashiwara and Schapira give a variety of bounds on the singular support of F' in terms of the singular support of F, when F' is obtained by applying a sheaf operation $(f_!, f^*, \otimes_{\mathbf{k}}, \cdots)$ to F. They are all easy to verify, even in the presentable setting, if one assumes that F is quasiconstructible and that f is a stratified mapping.

2.10. **Contact transformations.** Let $\tilde{V}$ and $\tilde{W}$ be vector spaces of the same dimension. Write $T^{*,\circ}\tilde{V}$ and $T^{*,\circ}\tilde{W}$ for the deleted cotangent bundles, i.e. the complements of the zero section in $T^*\tilde{V}$ and $T^*\tilde{W}$. Let $\mathbf{L}$ denote the germ of a smooth conic Lagrangian near the point $(0, p_0) \in T^*\tilde{V}$. A contact transformation is a kind of Darboux coordinate change near $(0, p_0)$, with additional requirements imposed to make it induce functors on sheaf categories associated to $\mathbf{L}$.

2.10.1. *Definition.* A contact transformation of $\mathbf{L}$ is the germ of a conic Lagrangian $\chi \subset T^*\tilde{V} \times T^*\tilde{W}$ through a point $((0,-p_0),(0,p'))$ that obeys the following:

(1) χ is the germ of the graph of a symplectomorphism $U_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} U'$, where $U_0 \subset T^*\tilde{V}$ is a neighborhood of $(0,p_0)$ and $U' \subset T^*\tilde{W}$ is a neighborhood of $(0,p')$. (The "graph" is modified to be Lagrangian, by applying $(x,\xi) \mapsto (x,-\xi)$ in the $T^*\tilde{V}$ factor.)
(2) Write $\chi(\mathbf{L})$ for the image of $\mathbf{L} \cap U_0$ under such a symplectomorphism. Then χ is the germ of the conormal bundle to a smooth hypersurface in $\tilde{V} \times \tilde{W}$ passing through the origin, and $\chi(\mathbf{L})$ is the conormal bundle to a smooth hypersurface in $\tilde{W}$ passing through the origin.

It is proved in [KaSc, Prop. A.2.5, Cor. A.2.7] that for every $\mathbf{L}$ one can find such a χ.

2.10.2. *Effect of a contact transformation on categories.* If $\tilde{V}_0 \subset \tilde{V}$ and $\tilde{W}_0 \subset \tilde{W}$ are sufficiently small neighborhoods of the origins, by a slight abuse of the notion of "germ" we may regard $\mathbf{L}$ as a conic Lagrangian in $T^*\tilde{V}_0$ and $\chi(\mathbf{L})$ as a conic Lagrangian in $T^*\tilde{W}_0$. The theory of contact transformations in [KaSc, §7.2] gives an equivalence between the localizations

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup\zeta_{\tilde{V}_0}}(\tilde{V}_0;\mathbf{k})/\mathrm{Loc}(\tilde{V}_0) \cong \mathrm{Sh}_{\chi(\mathbf{L})\cup\zeta_{\tilde{W}_0}}(\tilde{W}_0;\mathbf{k})/\mathrm{Loc}(\tilde{W}_0) \tag{2.10.1}$$

The notation Sh_Λ is as in §2.9.3 and the notation C/C' is as in §2.6.

The equivalence (2.10.1) is described by a kernel $K \in \mathrm{Sh}(\tilde{V}_0 \times \tilde{W}_0)$ §2.5. If $H \subset \tilde{V}_0 \times \tilde{W}_0$ is a hypersurface as in §2.10.1(2), then putting K to be the constant sheaf on H (extended by zero), one computes that K^{-1} (2.5.3) is also a suspension of constant sheaf on $\mathrm{flip}(H) \subset \tilde{V}_0 \times \tilde{W}_0$. The functors $K\circ$ and $K^{-1}\circ$ preserve the numerators and denominators of (2.10.1) and become inverse equivalences after passing to the localization.

2.10.3. *Contact transformations and microlocal stalks.* Since $\chi(\mathbf{L})$ is the conormal of a smooth hypersurface in $\tilde{W}_0$, the category on the right-hand side of (2.10.1) is easy to describe: the functor $\mu_{(0,p')}$ (2.9.2) gives an equivalence to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$. In fact the numerator of the right-hand side is described in the introduction §1.5.1; in those terms the microlocal stalk functor is the cone on the map (1.5.2).

The group of origin-preserving diffeomorphisms of $\tilde{W}$ acts on the set of contact transformations for $\mathbf{L}, (0, p_0)$ in the obvious way, with each diffeomorphism moving $(0, p')$ to $(0, p'')$ for another nonzero p''. If χ_1 and χ_2 differ by such a diffeomorphism, the composite functors $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup\zeta_{\tilde{V}_0}}(\tilde{V}_0; \mathbf{k})/\mathrm{Loc}(\tilde{V}_0) \cong \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ are canonically isomorphic in a strong sense, so that there is a natural map from the space of diffeomorphism-classes of contact transformations and the space of equivalences to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$.

2.11. **Guillermou-Kashiwara-Schapira.** Let M be a manifold, let $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an open set containing 0 and let $\varphi_t, t \in I$ be a one-parameter family of symplectomorphisms of $T^{*,\circ}M$ obeying

$$\varphi_0(x, \xi) = (x, \xi) \qquad \forall t \in I, r \in \mathbf{R}_{>0},\ \varphi_t(x, r\xi) = r\varphi_t(x, \xi)$$

In other words, φ_t is a homogeneous Hamiltonian isotopy of $T^{*,\circ}M$. Suppose that φ is horizontally compactly supported, in the sense that there is a compact open subset $A \subset M$ such that φ_t is the identity outside of T^*A for all t. The main theorem in [GKS] is the uniqueness and existence of a kernel K_t (§2.5) on $M \times M$ such that

(1) $K_t\circ$ and $K_t^{-1}\circ$ are inverse equivalences on $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M, \mathbf{k})$, notation as in (2.5.3).
(2) Away from the zero section one has $SS(K_t \circ F) = \varphi_t(SS(F))$

They furthermore prove that each K_t is locally bounded. If we make an additional tameness hypothesis on φ, the K_t are constructible on some Whitney stratification of $M \times M$. With this tameness hypothesis in place, essentially the same proof works in the presentable setting, giving constructible K_t whose fibers are perfect $\mathbf{k}$-modules — this perfectness property replacing the locally bounded property, when $\mathbf{k}$ is a ring spectrum.

We indicate a few details. The graphs G_t of φ_t determine a conic Lagrangian subset $G \subset T^{*,\circ}(M \times M \times I)$, so that G_t is the projection to $T^*(M \times M)$ of the slice at $t \in I$. We seek a sheaf K with singular support in $G \cup \zeta_{M\times M\times I}$ whose restriction to $M \times M \times \{0\}$ is the constant sheaf supported on the diagonal. The uniqueness of K can be proved exactly as in [GKS, Prop. 3.2].

For the existence of K, we impose the additional tameness assumption that φ is contained in the conormal variety (2.9.1) of a Whitney stratification of $M \times M \times I$ — for example this holds if φ is the Hamiltonian flow of a subanalytic function. Without further loss of generality we can assume that the projection $M \times M \times I \to I$ is a stratified Morse function, so that to construct K, it suffices to construct it locally around each critical value of $M \times M \times I \to I$ and argue that they can be glued. Steps (A) and (B) of the proof of [GKS, Prop. 3.5] give the local construction and the gluing argument.

Another consequence of the existence of K, is that for each $t \in I$ and each conic Lagrangian $\Lambda \subset T^{*,\circ}M$, the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{G\circ\Lambda}(M \times I) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{G_t\circ\Lambda}(M \times \{t\}) \tag{2.11.1}$$

is an equivalence — the proof is the same as [GKS, Prop. 3.12].

3. Wavefronts, brane structures, and Nadler-Zaslow

We will mostly apply the ideas of §2 in a somewhat special situation, for which collect notation here.

3.1. **Cotangent bundles.** If M is a manifold, its cotangent bundle T^*M is an symplectic symplectic manifold: if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are coordiantes on M and $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ are the dual cotangent coordinates, the canonical one-form and symplectic form are

$$\alpha := \xi_1 dx_1 + \cdots + \xi_n dx_n \qquad \omega = d\alpha$$

We let $\overline{T}^*M := T^*M \amalg T^\infty M$ be the relative compactification of T^*M given in [NaZa, §5.1.1]. The boundary $T^\infty M$ of $\overline{T}^*M$ is called "contact infinity"

3.2. **Exact Lagrangians.** An immersion $i : L \to T^*M$ is Lagrangian if $i^*\omega$ vanishes. It is *exact* if $i^*\alpha$ is an exact one-form. A function $f : L \to \mathbf{R}$ for which $df = \alpha$ is called a primitive for L. If L is connected then the primitive is unique up to an additive constant. We write Λ for the intersection $\overline{L} \cap T^\infty M$. It is not always necessary that Λ is smooth, but we will assume that L and $\overline{L}$ has tame topology in the sense of [NaZa, §5.2], which in particular implies that Λ is Legendrian wherever it is smooth. We let $\Phi \subset M$ denote the image of Λ under the front projection.

We will say that an exact Lagrangian is *lower exact* if any primitive for it is proper and bounded above. The tameness condition implies furthermore that the primitive has only finitely many critical values. The standard Lagrangians of [NaZa], when taken over an open subset of M, are always lower exact, as $\log(m) \to -\infty$ at the boundary of the open set. The costandard Lagrangians are not lower exact, however one can always find a Hamiltonian equivalent lower exact Lagrangian. For example the figure below depicts a costandard Lagrangian in $T^*\mathbf{R}$ on the left, and a Hamiltonian equivalent lower exact Lagrangian on the right.



3.3. **Legendrian lift and wavefront projection.** We equip $(T^*M) \times \mathbf{R}$ with the one-form $dt - \alpha$, where t denotes the projection to $\mathbf{R}$. (This is sometimes denoted J^1M, the one-jet space of M.) The projection $(T^*M) \times \mathbf{R} \to T^*M$ is called the *Lagrangian projection*, as it carries generic Legendrian subanifolds to immersed exact Lagrangians. The projection $(T^*M) \times \mathbf{R} \to M \times \mathbf{R}$ is called the *wavefront projection*, and it carries generic Legendrian submanifolds to immersed hypersurfaces in $M \times \mathbf{R}$ with wavefront singularities. We will only need to impose (1.5.1), a weaker condition than genericity on L, that the wavefront projection is finite-to-one.

We often use the following notation. If L is connected and $L \hookrightarrow T^*M$ is an exact Lagrangian immersion, we let $\mathbf{L} \subset (T^*M) \times \mathbf{R}$ denote the Legendrian submanifold that lifts L, and $\mathbf{F} \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$ the image of $\mathbf{L}$ under π_{f}. These subsets are well-defined up to translation in the $\mathbf{R}$-coordinate.

If $\mathbf{L}$ obeys (1.5.1), then we may recover $\mathbf{L}$ from $\mathbf{F}$ by writing a branch of $\mathbf{F}$ as the graph of a smooth function $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ defined over an open subset of M, and putting ξ to be the gradient of t. The meaning of "wavefront singularities" is that the closure of the set where this recipe is well-defined is smooth, and we recover $\mathbf{L}$ as this closure.

Our tameness hypotheses along with lower exactness §3.2 imply that the closure $\overline{\mathbf{F}}$ of $\mathbf{F}$ in $M \times [-\infty, \infty)$ is $\mathbf{F} \amalg \Phi \times \{-\infty\}$. It furthermore implies that $M \times [-\infty, \infty)$ has a Whitney stratification refining the decomposition by

$$\mathbf{F},\ M \times \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{F},\ \Phi \times \{-\infty\},\ \text{ and } M \times \{-\infty\} \tag{3.3.1}$$

If Λ is smooth, then for $K \ll 0$ we have a stratification-preserving homeomorphism of $\overline{\mathbf{F}}$ with $\Phi \times [-\infty, K)$.

3.4. **Example.** For example, the wavefront projection of the right-hand Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}$ of the figure of §3.2 looks like this:

In the next figure we indicate a sheaf on $\mathbf{R}^2$ with singular support in $\mathbf{L}$ that is free of rank one on the under-side of the wavefront and zero on the other side — the solid line indicates "standard" boundary conditions and the dotted lines indicate "costandard" boundary conditions, in the sense of [NaZa, §4.1].



3.5. **$\mathbf{L}$ as a conic Lagrangian.** Let L be as in §3.2 and $\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{F}$ as in §3.3. If we write (x, t, ξ, τ) for coordinates on $T^*(M \times \mathbf{R})$ (where $(x, \xi) \in T^*M$ and $(t, \tau) \in T^*\mathbf{R}$, in the notation of §3.1) then it is natural to regard $T^*M \times \mathbf{R}$ as the contact hypersurface $\{\tau = -1\}$ in $T^*(M \times \mathbf{R})$, and $\mathbf{L}$ determines a conic Lagrangian $\mathrm{Cone}(\mathbf{L}) \subset T^*(M \times \mathbf{R})$ which we define as

$$\mathrm{Cone}(\mathbf{L}) = \zeta_{M \times \mathbf{R}} \cup \{(x, t, \xi, \tau) \mid \tau < 0 \text{ and } (x, -\xi/\tau, t) \in \mathbf{L}\}. \tag{3.5.1}$$

We will write $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ in place of $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{Cone}(\mathbf{L})}(M \times \mathbf{R})$. If U is an open subset of $M \times \mathbf{R}$ and Ω is a connected component of $\pi_{\mathrm{f}}^{-1}(U) \cap \mathbf{L}$, we similarly define $\mathrm{Cone}(\Omega) \subset T^*U$, and write $\mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega}(U)$ in place of $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{Cone}(\Omega)}(U)$.

Let $\mathbf{F}^{sm}$ be the smooth portion of $\mathbf{F} \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$, and let $\mathbf{L}^{sm}$ be the preimage under the front projection π_{f} — thus, $\pi_{\mathrm{f}} : \mathbf{L}^{sm} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{F}^{sm}$. Each point $p \in \mathbf{L}^{sm}$ determines a microlocal stalk functor (2.9.2)

$$\mu_p : \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}), \tag{3.5.2}$$

as we may find a stratification $\mathcal{S}$ of $M \times \mathbf{R}$ such that the connected components of $\mathbf{F}^{sm}$ are the codimension-one strata and the connected components of $M \times \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{F}$ are the open strata. If p, q are two points in the same connected component of $\mathbf{L}^{sm}$, then $\mu_p \cong \mu_q$.

By compactifying this stratification refining (3.3.1), one sees that the restriction of the functor $\mathrm{proj}_{1,*} : \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M)$ to $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ is continuous by §2.9.1.

3.6. **Lower exact Lagrangian and eventually conic Lagrangians.** In this section, we will show that lower exact Lagrangians (with a smooth Legendrian boundary) and eventually conical Lagrangians are related by a Reeb perturbation.

Fix a Riemannian metric on M, and let $ST^*M \subset T^*M$ be the unit sphere bundle with its contact 1-form. Let $(T^*M)_{|\xi|\leq 1} \subset T^*M$ be the unit disk bundle. It is a Weinstein domain (in the sense of e.g. [CiEl, Def. 11.10]). If L is a lower exact Lagrangian with a primitive $f : L \to \mathbf{R}$ and $\Lambda = L^\infty$ is smooth, there exists $K_0 \ll 0$ such that each level set $\{f = K\}, K \leq K_0$, gives a smooth Legendrian submanifold $\Lambda_{f=K}$ in $T^{*,\circ}M/\mathbf{R}_{>0} \simeq ST^*M$ via the obvious quotient map $T^{*,\circ}M \longrightarrow T^{*,\circ}M/\mathbf{R}_{>0}$, where $T^{*,\circ}M := T^*M - \zeta_M$.

Lemma. (a) Under the above assumptions, for K_0 sufficiently negative, the family of Legendrians $\{\Lambda_{f=K}\}_{-\infty\leq K\leq K_0}$ starting from $\Lambda_{f=-\infty} := \Lambda$ is a Legendrian isotopy generated by the contact Hamiltonian flow $\varphi^s_{H_L}$ of a time dependent family of strictly positive contact Hamiltonian functions $H^s_L, s \in [0,1]$ (c.f. [Gei, 2.3]), expect $H^0_L = 0$, after a renormalization of the interval $\eta : [-\infty, K_0] \xrightarrow{\sim} [0,1]$.

(b) There is a fringed set $I \subset \mathbf{R}^2_+$ (c.f. [NaZa, p259]) and an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ with $\{\epsilon_0\} \times \mathbf{R}_+ \cap I \neq \emptyset$ such that we have

$$\varphi^{s-\epsilon_0}_{H_L}(\Lambda) \cap \varphi^{s+t-\epsilon_0}_{H_L}(\Lambda) = \emptyset.$$

for any $(s,t) \in I$ and $s \geq \epsilon_0$. In particular, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, such that for any $0 < \delta \ll \epsilon$, we have

$$\varphi^{s}_{H_L}(\Lambda) \cap \varphi^{s+t}_{H_L}(\Lambda) = \emptyset,$$

for all $s \in [0,\delta), t \in (0,\epsilon)$.

Proof. The normalized gradient vector field X_f of f at $(x,\xi) \in \{f = K\}$, with respect to the induced metric on L, lies in the span of the Liouville vector field, the Reeb vector field and the tangent space $T_{(x,\xi)}\{f = K\}$, for $K \leq K_0$. By the assumption that f has only finitely many critical values, the factor of X_f in the Reeb direction is strictly positive for $K \ll 0$. Therefore, under the projection $T^{*,\circ}X \longrightarrow T^{*,\circ}X/\mathbf{R}_{>0} \simeq ST^*X$, the push-forward of X_f is a positive multiple of the Reeb vector field modulo the tangent space to $\Lambda_{f=K}$. This means $\{\Lambda_{f=K}\}_{K\leq K_0}$, as a Legendrian isotopy starting from $\Lambda_{f=K_0}$, is generated by the flow of a time-dependent vector field Y^s, which is everywhere a negative multiple of the Reeb vector field, then part (a) of the lemma follows.

Part (b) of the lemma follows from a similar argument as in the proof of [NaZa, Lemma 5.2.5]. □

On the other hand, let $\Lambda_1 \subset ST^*M$ be a Legendrian submanifold in general position — i.e. whose projection map to M is finite. If $L_1 \to (T^*M)_{|\xi|\leq 1}$ is an exact Lagrangian filling of Λ_1, possibly immersed but embedded in a collar neighborhood of the boundary Λ_1, there is a standard conical completion $\widetilde{L_1}$ of L_1. We say that $\widetilde{L_1}$ is "eventually conical". It is another exact Lagrangian but it is never lower exact — in fact the primitive for $\widetilde{L_1}$ is bounded below. However, by a similar argument as in Lemma 3.6, we can produce a good source of lower exact Lagrangians from them:

Proposition. After a normalized Reeb perturbation, an eventually conical exact Lagrangian is a lower exact Lagrangian in the sense of §3.2.

Proof. More precisely, let X_H be the Hamiltonian vector field (on $T^{*,\circ}M$) for the function $H(x,\xi) = |\xi|$. Choose a vector field on T^*M supported on $T^*M_{\{|\xi|\geq 1\}}$ of the form $X(x,\xi) = \beta(|\xi|)X_H$, where $\beta(r)$ is a smooth function of r satisfying that $\beta(r) = \frac{1}{r}, r \geq r_0$ for some $r_0 > 1$. The time-ϵ_0 flow $\varphi_X^{\epsilon_0}$ takes $\widetilde{L_1}$ to an exact Lagrangian L_{ϵ_0} whose primitive f_{ϵ_0} achieves $-\infty$ on $L_{\epsilon_0}^{\infty}$. □

Remark. The property of being eventually conic is not well behaved under taking products, but the property of being lower exact is. This gives a way to deform the product of two eventually conic Lagrangians to be eventually conic.

3.7. **Lagrangian and Legendrian Grassmannians.** Let $\mathrm{LagGr}(n)$ denote the space of isotropic n-planes in the linear symplectic space $T^*\mathbf{R}^n$. Let L_0 denote the cotangent fiber above 0. The *Maslov cycle* $\overline{Z}_1(n) \subset \mathrm{LagGr}(n)$ is the subspace of those n-planes that are not transverse to L_0. It has real codimension 1 in $\mathrm{LagGr}(n)$, the notation indicates that it is the closure of a Schubert-type stratum. It is observed in [Wein] (who attributes it to [Give, §10]) that $\overline{Z}_1(n)$ is the wavefront projection of a smooth Legendrian $\tilde{Z}_1(n) \subset T^\infty\mathrm{LagGr}(n)$:

Proposition. Let $\tilde{Z}_1(n) \subset \mathrm{LagGr}(n) \times \mathbf{R}P(L_0)$ be the set of pairs $(L,[v])$ with $[v] \subset L \cap L_0$. Then $\widetilde{Z}_1(n)$ is a smooth manifold, $\mathrm{proj}_1 : \widetilde{Z}_1(n) \to \overline{Z}_1(n)$ is a resolution of singularities, and there is a unique Legendrian embedding $\tilde{Z}_1(n) \to T^\infty\mathrm{LagGr}(n)$ whose projection to $\mathrm{LagGr}(n)$ is proj_1.

We have a natural identification

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{Z}_1(n) &= \{(L,v) \mid v \in L_0 \cap L \text{ and } v \neq 0\} \\ &= \{(L,[v]) \mid [v] \in \mathbf{R}P(L_0) \quad v \in L_0 \cap L\} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7.1}$$

which comes with a natural projection $\widetilde{Z}_1(n) \to \mathbf{R}P^{n-1}$ sending $(L,[v])$ to $[v]$. The fiber of the projection over any $[v] \in \mathbf{R}P^{n-1}$ can be naturally identified with the Lagrangian Grassmannian of $(\mathbf{R}v)^{\perp\omega}/\mathbf{R}v$, and we have a fiber sequence

$$\mathrm{LagGr}(n-1) \to \widetilde{Z}_1(n) \to \mathbf{R}P^{n-1} \tag{3.7.2}$$

for each $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$. For example when $n = 2$, the sequence (3.7.2) exhibits $\widetilde{Z}_1(2)$ as a Klein bottle — the nontrivial $S^1 = \mathbf{R}P^1$ bundle over S^1. The sequence (3.7.2) has a section for every n, sending $[v]$ to $(L_0,[v])$. Because of this in the limit we have a splitting $\widetilde{Z}_1 := \varinjlim \widetilde{Z}_1(n)$ as $\mathrm{LagGr} \times \mathbf{R}P^\infty$.

We are interested in $\widetilde{Z}_1(n)$ because it is like a "Legendrian Grassmannian," in the sense that it admits a Gauss map from any Legendrian submanifold of $T^\infty\mathbf{R}^n$. Indeed if the point (x,ρ) lies on $\Lambda \subset T^\infty\mathbf{R}^n$, then if v points into the symplectization and L is the tangent space of the cone over the Legendrian at v, then the Gauss map is given by

$$\Lambda \to \widetilde{Z}_1(n) : (x,\rho) \mapsto (L,[v])$$

where $[v]$ is the class of v in $\mathbf{R}P(T_x^*\mathbf{R}^n) \cong \mathbf{R}P(L_0)$.

3.8. **Brane structures, Tamarkin-Guillermou theory, and the Nadler-Zaslow functor.** Let $L \to T^*M$ be a lower exact Lagrangian immersion with Legendrian lift $\mathbf{L} \subset (T^*M) \times \mathbf{R}$. In the rest of this section we construct $\mathrm{Brane}_{\mathbf{L}}$, a locally constant sheaf of stable ∞-categories on $\mathbf{L}$, with fiber $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}) \in \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$. It is a special case of the more general construction of §2.8 which puts a sheaf of categories on any conic Lagrangian subset of T^*M.

3.9. **Good neighborhoods and good cylinders.** We define a *good neighborhood* in $M \times \mathbf{R}$ (with respect to $\mathbf{L}$) to be a contractible open subset $U \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$ with a piecewise-smooth boundary, such that ∂U is transverse to $\mathbf{F}$, and the following condition holds for each of the finitely many connected components $\Omega \subset \pi_{\mathrm{f}}^{-1}(U)$:

> there exists a point $p = (x, \xi) \in \Omega$, and a stratification-preserving flow of U (for a stratification compatible with $\pi_{\mathrm{f}}(\Omega)$) that contracts U to x.

We say that a good neighborhood is a *good cylinder* if it has the form $B \times I$ where B is a contractible open subset of M, $I \subset \mathbf{R}$ is an open interval, and $(B \times \partial I) \cap \mathbf{F}$ is empty. Our tameness assumptions on L §3.2 imply that every point of $M \times \mathbf{R}$ is contained in a good neighborhood (resp. good cylinder) that can be taken arbitrarily small. We call the connected components Ω of $\pi_{\mathrm{f}}^{-1}(U) \subset \mathbf{L}$ the "branches" of $\mathbf{L}$ in the good neighborhood (resp. good cylinder). For each branch Ω, there is a local contact transformation on $T^*(B \times I) - \zeta_{B\times I}$ sending Ω to the conormal of a smooth hypersurface 2.10, and we can deduce the following:

Lemma (Branch lemma)**.** Let U be a good neighborhood and let Ω be a branch of $\mathbf{L}$ over U. Let $p \in \Omega \cap \mathbf{L}^{sm}$. Then the sequence of presentable stable ∞-categories

$$\mathrm{Loc}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega}(U) \xrightarrow{\mu_p} \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}) \tag{3.9.1}$$

where the first map is the full inclusion and the second map is the microlocal stalk (2.9.2), (3.5.2), is a localization sequence §2.6. That is, $\mathrm{Loc}(U)$ is the kernel of μ_p and the right adjoint to μ_p is fully faithful.

If we write $\mathbf{L}|_U := \pi_{\mathrm{f}}^{-1}(U)$ for the union of all branches of $\mathbf{L}$ over U, the square in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Loc}(U) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega}(U) & \xrightarrow{\mu_p} & \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}|_U - \Omega}(U) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(U) & \xrightarrow[\mu_p]{} & \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k}) \end{array} \tag{3.9.2}$$

commutes — each arrow in the square is a full inclusion. Both of the rows are localization sequences, so that $\mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega}/\mathrm{Loc}(U)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(U)/\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}|_U - \Omega}(U)$.

Let $\mathrm{Nb}(L)$ denote the set of "branched neighborhoods", i.e. the set of pairs (U, Ω) such that $U \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$ is a good neighborhood and Ω is a branch of $\mathbf{L}$ over U. We endow $\mathrm{Nb}(U)$ with a partial order by putting $(U, \Omega) \leq (U', \Omega')$ if $U \subset U'$ and $\Omega = U \cap \Omega'$. The poset $\mathrm{Nb}(L)$ indexes a complete cover of L in the sense of §2.2.1(3), by $(U, \Omega) \mapsto \Omega$. It also projects finite-to-one onto the poset of open subsets of $M \times \mathbf{R}$, by $(U, \Omega) \mapsto U$.

The same remarks hold for the poset of "branched cylinders", i.e. the set of triples (B, I, Ω) such that $B \times I$ is a good cylinder and $(B \times I, \Omega) \in \mathrm{Nb}(L)$. We will denote this poset by $\mathrm{Cylb}(L)$.

3.10. **Multiple branches.** A good neighborhood U meets the complement of $\mathbf{F}$ in finitely many chambers. If $U = B \times (a, b)$ is a good cylinder, we may speak of the "bottom chamber" that is incident with $B \times \{a\}$ and the "top chamber" that is incident with $B \times \{b\}$. (It is possible for these to coincide.) The image of the right adjoint of μ_p (3.9.1) (i.e. the right orthogonal to $\mathrm{Loc}(U)$) is the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega}(U)$ spanned by sheaves that vanish in the bottom region of U.

Let $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega}(U)$ denote the full subcategory of sheaves that vanish in the *top* region of U. Although it is not the image of the right adjoint of μ_p (3.9.1) it is canonically equivalent

to $\mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U)/\mathrm{Loc}(U)$ by the composite $\mathrm{Sh}^0_\Omega(U) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U)/\mathrm{Loc}(U)$. As U is contractible there is a *left* adjoint to the inclusion functor $\mathrm{Loc}(U) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U)$, which carries F to the tensor product of ω_U and the constant sheaf with fiber $\Gamma_c(U;F)$ (2.5.2), and it vanishes on $\mathrm{Sh}^0_\Omega(U)$. In other words

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_\Omega(U) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U) \to \mathrm{Loc}(U) \tag{3.10.1}$$

is a localization sequence §2.6.

Proposition. Let U be a good cylinder and let $\mathbf{L}|_U = \Omega_1 \amalg \cdots \amalg \Omega_k$ be the branches of $\mathbf{L}$ over U. Then the functor $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}|_U}(U)$ induced by the inclusions $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}|_U}(U)$ is an equivalence.

We give the proof below. A similar argument can be used to conclude that, for δ sufficiently small relative to $B_\alpha \times I_\alpha$, the functor $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ induces fully faithful embeddings

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_\alpha}(B_\alpha \times I_\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{\Omega_\alpha \cup T_{-\delta}\Omega_\alpha}(B_\alpha \times I_\alpha) \tag{3.10.2}$$

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(B_\alpha \times I_\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(B_\alpha \times I_\alpha) \tag{3.10.3}$$

The right adjoint functors to (3.10.2), resp. (3.10.3), are given by microlocalization along $\Omega_\alpha \subset \Omega_\alpha \cup T_{-\delta}\Omega_\alpha$, resp. $\mathbf{L} \subset \mathbf{L} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}$, along with (3.9.1).

Proof. It will suffice to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, F_j) = 0$ when $F_i \in \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i}(U)$, $F_j \in \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_j}(U)$ and $i \neq j$. Let us choose linear coordinates on $U = B \times I$, by fixing an open embedding $B \hookrightarrow E$ where E is a vector space — then Ω_1 and Ω_2 are embedded disjointly in $E \times E^*$. By taking U sufficiently small we may assume that the projections to E^* are disjoint:

$$\mathrm{proj}_{E^*}(\Omega_i) \subset B_i \qquad \mathrm{proj}_{E^*}(\Omega_j) \subset B_j \qquad \overline{B_i} \cap \overline{B_j} = \varnothing \tag{3.10.4}$$

where B_i and B_j are small balls in E^*.

We will use a (non-conic) Fourier functor relating sheaves on $E \times \mathbf{R}$ to sheaves on $E^* \times \mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E \times \mathbf{R})_{<0}$ and $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E^* \times \mathbf{R})_{<0}$ be the essential images of the functors $T_{(-\infty,0]}$ defined in §3.13, and let K_χ be the constant sheaf on the hypersurface $\{(q,p,t) \in E \times E^* \times \mathbf{R} \mid t + q \cdot p = 0\}$ Then

$$T_{(-\infty,0]} \circ K_\chi : \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E \times \mathbf{R})_{<0} \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E^* \times \mathbf{R})_{<0} \tag{3.10.5}$$

is an equivalence.

Let $\Omega_i' \to E \times E^* \times \mathbf{R}$ be a map extending the Legendrian $\Omega_i \to E \times E^* \times \mathbf{R}$ so that the projection of $\Omega_i' \to E \times \mathbf{R}$ is "eventually radial" in the sense that it agrees with a conic subset of $E \times \mathbf{R}$ outside of Ω_i — the image of Ω_i' in E^* is the closure of the image of Ω_i in E^*. The restriction map $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i' \cup \Omega_j'}(E \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i \cup \Omega_j}(U)$ is an equivalence, write F_i' and F_j' for the image of F_i and F_j under the inverse equivalence.

We have a containment $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\Omega_i' \cup \Omega_j'}(E \times \mathbf{R}) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(E \times \mathbf{R})_{<0}$. We claim that the image of F_i' under (3.10.5) has support in $\overline{B}_i \times \mathbf{R}$. The reason is $T_{(-\infty,0]}$ kills quasi-constructible sheaves in $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}((E^* - \overline{B}_i) \times \mathbf{R})_{\geq 0}$. Similarly, the image of F_j' under (3.10.5) vanishes outside of $B_j \times \mathbf{R}$ — so the supports of these sheaves do not overlap, we must have $\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, F_j) = 0$.

□

3.11. **Definition of Brane_L and μmon.** We will give a recipe for the sheaf of ∞-categories Brane_L on L in terms of a functor $\mathrm{Nb}(L) \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ which we will define first, in (3.11.2). We will abuse notation and denote this functor by Brane_L as well — to avoid confusion we will write $\Gamma(\Omega, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ for the sections of Brane_L over an open subset $\Omega \subset L$, and $\mathrm{Brane}_L(U, \Omega)$ for the value of (3.11.2) on $(U, \Omega) \in \mathrm{Nb}(L)$.

For each $(U, \Omega) \in \mathrm{Nb}(L)$, the category $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U; \mathbf{k})$ has a pair of full subcategories

$$\mathrm{Loc}(U) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U)$$

which are preserved by the pullback functors $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(U')$ whenever $(U', \Omega') \leq (U, \Omega)$. We may regard it as a functor

$$\mathrm{Nb}(L) \to \mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}) \qquad (U, \Omega) \to \big[\mathrm{Loc}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U)\big] \tag{3.11.1}$$

We define

$$\mathrm{Brane}_L(U, \Omega) := \mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(U)/\mathrm{Loc}(U) \tag{3.11.2}$$

or more formally to be the composite $\mathrm{Nb}(L) \xrightarrow{(3.11.1)} \mathrm{Fun}(\Delta^1, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}) \xrightarrow{(2.6.1)} \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$.

By (3.9.1), the value of (3.11.2) on any element of $\mathrm{Nb}(L)$ is (noncanonically) equivalent to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbf{k})$ — in fact it carries every arrow in $\mathrm{Nb}(L)$ to an equivalence. That is, (3.11.2) is a locally constant functor (in the sense of §2.2.2) $\mathrm{Nb}(L) \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$. Since $\mathrm{Nb}(L)$ is a complete covering of L by contractible open subsets, this functor determines a locally constant sheaf on L — it is given explicitly by

$$\Gamma(\Omega, \mathrm{Brane}_L) = \varprojlim_{\mathrm{Nb}(L)_{/\Omega}} \mathrm{Brane}_L(U', \Omega') \tag{3.11.3}$$

where the limit is over the subposet of $\mathrm{Nb}(L)_{/\Omega} \subset \mathrm{Nb}(L)$ given by pairs (U', Ω') with $\Omega' \subset \Omega$.

For each $(U, \Omega) \in \mathrm{Nb}(L)$, we have the composite functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}|_U}(U) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}|_U}(U)/\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}|_U - \Omega}(U) \cong \mathrm{Brane}_L(U, \Omega)$$

where the first arrow is restriction, the second arrow is localization, and the third is the equivalence given by (3.9.2). By the universal property of limits they assemble to a functor $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \varprojlim \mathrm{Brane}_L(U, \Omega)$, i.e. to

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \tag{3.11.4}$$

which we denote by μmon, microlocal monodromy.

3.12. **Cylindrical Čech covers.** We will say that a Čech covering (in the sense of §2.2.1) of $M \times \mathbf{R}$ is a "good cylindrical covering" if every chart in the covering is either empty or a good cylinder. If $\mathcal{V}$ is a good cylindrical covering, then the set of triples $(B, I, \Omega) \in \mathrm{Cylb}(L)$ such that $B \times I \in \mathcal{V}$ is itself a Čech covering of L. Thus, for a good cylindrical covering we can compute $\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L)$ as a smaller limit:

$$\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \cong \varprojlim_{(B,I,\Omega)|B\times I \in \mathcal{V}} \mathrm{Brane}_L(B \times I, \Omega)$$

Let us prove here that good cylindrical covers exist, and can be taken arbitrarily fine. That is, if $\mathcal{V}'$ is any covering of $M \times \mathbf{R}$, there is a locally finite refinement $\mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{V}$ is a good cylindrical cover.

Proof. Let $\{\Omega'_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in J'}$ be the covering of $\mathbf{L}$ determined by $\mathcal{V}'$. Fix a Whitney stratification $\mathcal{S}$ on $M\times\mathbf{R}$ compatible with $\mathbf{F}$, whose open strata are the connected components of $M\times\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{F}$. We prove the statement by induction on the dimension of the strata. We will use $\mathcal{S}_{\geq k}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_{\leq k}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{=k}$) to denote the subcollection of strata that have dimension greater than or equal to k (resp. less than or equal to k and equal to k).

First, for each $q=(x_q,t_q)\in\mathcal{S}_{=0}$ and $p\in\pi_{\mathrm{f}}^{-1}(q)$, one can choose a good cylinder (B,I,Ω) with $p\in\Omega$ as follows. Let $\mathrm{r}^2_{x_q}$ (resp. $\mathrm{r}^2_{t_q}$) be the distance squared function from x_q in M (resp. from t_q in $\mathbf{R}$). Choose an $\epsilon_0>0$ such that $\mathrm{r}^2_{x_q}+\mathrm{r}^2_{t_q}$ has no $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}}$-critical value in $(0,\epsilon_0^2)$ and such that

$$(\{x_q\}\times\mathbf{R})\cap\mathbf{F}\cap B_{\epsilon_0}(q)=\{q\}.$$

In particular, we have $\partial(B_\epsilon(q))$ is transverse to $\mathcal{S}$ for any $0<\epsilon<\epsilon_0$. Fix an $\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_0)$ and let $\mathcal{S}^\epsilon_q$ be the unique minimal stratification determined by the two transverse stratifications $\mathcal{S}$ and $\{B_\epsilon(q),\partial(B_\epsilon(q)),M-\overline{B}_\epsilon(q)\}$. Choose $\delta_0>0$ such that $\mathrm{r}^2_{x_q}$ has no $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S}^\epsilon_q}$-critical value in $(0,\delta_0^2)$ and $\mathbf{F}\cap B_\epsilon(q)\cap\{\mathrm{r}^2_{t_q}\geq\epsilon^2-\delta_0^2\}=\emptyset$. Now fix any $\delta\in(0,\delta_0)$, let $B=\{\mathrm{r}^2_{x_q}<\delta^2\}\subset M$, $I=\{\mathrm{r}^2_{t_q}<\epsilon^2-\delta^2\}\subset\mathbf{R}$ and Ω be the unique component of $\mathbf{L}\cap(T^*(B)\times I)$ that contains p, then (B,I,Ω) is a good cylinder. One can make Ω arbitrarily small, and in particular, contained in $\bigcap_{p\in\Omega'_\alpha}\Omega'_\alpha$.

Second, for any $S_\beta\in\mathcal{S}$ of codimension greater than 0, the projection $\pi_M|_{S_\beta}:S_\beta\to\pi_M(S_\beta)$ is a local diffeomorphism. After a refinement of $\mathcal{S}$, we can assume that $\pi_M|_{S_\beta}$ is a diffeomorphism, and there exists a tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{T}_\beta$ of S_β, such that the projection

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta\cap\left(\bigcup_{S_\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_{\leq\dim M}}S_\alpha\right)\to M$$

is a stratified map for a stratification $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ on M compatible with $\pi_M(S_\beta)$. Now choose a tube system of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$ with the tube data of $\pi_M(S_\beta)$ given by $(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\beta,\widetilde{\pi}_\beta,\widetilde{\rho}_\beta)$, where $\widetilde{\pi}_\beta:\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\beta\to\pi_M(S_\beta)$ is a retraction and $\widetilde{\rho}_\beta$ is a distance function. Then the preimage $\pi_M^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\beta)\cap\mathcal{T}_\beta$ defines a tube for S_β, in the sense that there is a retraction from $\pi_M^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\beta)\cap\mathcal{T}_\beta$ to S_β and $\rho_\beta=\sqrt{\widetilde{\rho}_\beta^2+\Delta t^2}$ is a distance function compatible with it, where Δt is the difference in the t-coordinate. Now repeating the argument in the first step, we can show that for any point $(x,t)\in S_\beta$, there exists a contractible neighborhood $U_x\subset\pi_M(S_\beta)$ with piecewise smooth boundary, $\delta_x>0$ and $a_x<t<b_x$, such that

$$(\widetilde{\pi}_\beta^{-1}U_x\cap\{\tilde{\rho}_\beta<r\})\times(a_x,b_x) \tag{3.12.1}$$

is a good cylinder for all $0<r<\delta_x$, and it is contained in one of the open sets in $\mathcal{V}'$. It is clear that if we replace U_x by any smaller contractible neighborhood $U'_x\subset U_x$ in (3.12.1), then it is also a good cylinder.

Next, suppose we have chosen a good cylindrical cover $\{(B_\alpha,I_\alpha,\Omega_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in J_{\leq k}}$ of a neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}_{\leq k}$, which is a refinement of $\mathcal{V}'$. For any $S_\beta\in\mathcal{S}_{=k+1}$, let $U_{S_\beta,\alpha}=\pi_M((B_\alpha\times I_\alpha)\cap S_\beta)$ for $\alpha\in J_{\leq k}$. Now extend $\{U_{S_\beta,\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in J_{\leq k}}$ to a locally finite open covering $\{U_{S_\beta,\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in J_\beta}$ (J_β is an index set containing $J_{\leq k}$) of $S_\beta\simeq\pi_M(S_\beta)$, such that each of $\{U_{S_\beta,\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in J_\beta-J_{\leq k}}$ is contained in U_x for some $x\in S_\beta$, c.f. (3.12.1) and there is a neighborhood of ∂S_β where the newly added open sets don't intersect. Furthermore, we can refine the covering (only change the newly added ones) so that any finite intersection

$\bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} U_{S_\beta,\alpha_i}$ is either empty or contractible. By induction (which stops at $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \dim M}$), we get the desired claim.

□

3.13. **Tamarkin's convolution.** For each $s \in \mathbf{R}$, we will write T_s for the translation-in-the-second-coordinate operator on $M \times \mathbf{R}$ and $(T^*M) \times \mathbf{R}$, given by the formula $T_s(x,t) = (x, t+s)$. Write $T_s\mathbf{L}$ and $T_s\mathbf{F}$ for the image of $\mathbf{L}$ or $\mathbf{F}$ under T_s. We also abuse notation and write T_s in place of $T_{s,*}$ for the functor $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ induced by T_s.

For each sheaf $I \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(\mathbf{R})$, Tamarkin studies an endofunctor $T_I : \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times \mathbf{R})$. It is given by the formula

$$T_I F := \overrightarrow{T}_!(\mathrm{proj}_2^* I \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} \overleftarrow{T}^* F) \tag{3.13.1}$$

where proj_2 is the projection $M \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$, $\overrightarrow{T}, \overleftarrow{T} : M \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \to M \times \mathbf{R}$ are given by addition in the second two factors and projection onto the first two factors, respectively. When I is the skyscraper sheaf at s then $T_I = T_s$. We will also be interested in the functors T_I, restricted to the subcategory $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$, when I is a constant sheaf on a half-open interval or a ray.

For example, the following figure indicates the boundary conditions of the image of the sheaf of §3.4 under $T_{(-\delta,0]}$:



3.14. **Tamarkin convolution on $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$.** The exact triangles

$$\mathbf{k}_{(-\infty,0]} \to \mathbf{k}_{\{0\}} \to \Sigma\mathbf{k}_{(-\infty,0)} \to$$
$$\mathbf{k}_{[0,\infty)} \to \mathbf{k}_{\{0\}} \to \Sigma\mathbf{k}_{(0,\infty)} \to$$
$$\mathbf{k}_{(-\delta,0]} \to \mathbf{k}_{(-\infty,0]} \to \mathbf{k}_{(-\infty,-\delta]} \to$$

of sheaves on $\mathbf{R}$ induce exact triangles of endofunctors

$$T_{(-\infty,0]} \to 1 \to \Sigma \circ T_{(-\infty,0)} \to \tag{3.14.1}$$
$$T_{[0,\infty)} \to 1 \to \Sigma \circ T_{(0,\infty)} \to \tag{3.14.2}$$
$$T_{(-\delta,0]} \to T_{(-\infty,0]} \to T_{(-\infty,-\delta]} \to \tag{3.14.3}$$

The subcategory $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ is stable by the functors in (3.14.1) and (3.14.2), and the maps $1 \to \Sigma \circ T_{(-\infty,0)}$ and $1 \to \Sigma \circ T_{(0,\infty)}$ are idempotent, and correspond to localizations of $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$: (3.14.1) is the localization by the subcategory $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ (whose quotient is $\mathrm{Loc}(M \times \mathbf{R})$) and (3.14.2) is the localization by the subcategory $\mathrm{Loc}(M \times \mathbf{R})$. Similar to (3.10.1), the composite

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})/\mathrm{Loc}(M \times \mathbf{R})$$

is an equivalence, although the image of the right adjoint is the image of $\Sigma \circ T_{(0,\infty)}$.

On $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$, the functor $T_{(-\infty,0]}$ acts as the identity, and $T_{(-\infty,-\delta]}$ acts as $T_{-\delta}$. Thus the second arrow in (3.14.3) induces a natural map

$$F \to T_{-\delta} F \tag{3.14.4}$$

whenever F is $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$. As $T_{-\delta}F$ lies in $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$, the homotopy fiber $T_{(-\delta,0]}F$ lies in $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ — we study these categories in the next section.

3.15. **The total Tamarkin convolution.** In this section we construct, for δ and δ' sufficiently small, a canonical equivalence

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R})\cong\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta'}\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R}) \tag{3.15.1}$$

In fact, when $L\to T^*M$ is an embedding, (3.15.1) holds for all δ,δ'.

Let $\mathcal{R}\subset(0,\infty)\times M\times\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}$ be the set of quadruples (δ,x,t_1,t_2) such that $-\delta\leq t_2<0$. Define a correspondence

$$M\times\mathbf{R}\xleftarrow{\overleftarrow{T}_{tot}}\mathcal{R}\xrightarrow{\overrightarrow{T}_{tot}}(0,\infty)\times M\times\mathbf{R}$$

where $\overleftarrow{T}_{tot}(\delta,m,t_1,t_2):=(m,t_1)$ and $\overrightarrow{T}_{tot}(\delta,m,t_1,t_2):=(\delta,m,t_1+t_2)$. Then we have a continuous functor

$$T_{tot}=\left(\overrightarrow{T}_{tot}\right)_!\left(\overleftarrow{T}_{tot}\right)^*:\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathrm{Sh}_{all}((0,\infty)\times M\times\mathbf{R})).$$

It follows from the base-change formula that for each $\delta\in(0,\infty)$, the composite

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M\times\mathbf{R})\xrightarrow{T_{tot}}\mathrm{Sh}_{all}((0,\infty)\times M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M\times\mathbf{R})$$

where the second arrow is the restriction to $\{\delta\}\times M\times\mathbf{R}$, is isomorphic to $T_{(-\delta,0]}$. If $F\in\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R})$, then $T_{tot}F$ has singular support in the suspension of the family of Legendrians $\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-s}\mathbf{L}$, $s\in(0,\infty)$ that we will denote by $T_{tot}\mathbf{L}\subset T^*((0,\infty)\times M)\times\mathbf{R}$. We will construct (3.15.1) by proving that for every $\delta>0$, the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{T_{tot}\mathbf{L}}((0,\infty)\times M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R}) \tag{3.15.2}$$

is an equivalence. For some $\epsilon>0$, the same argument shows $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{T_{tot}\mathbf{L}}((0,\epsilon)\times M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R})$ is an equivalence for every $\delta<\epsilon$, proving (3.15.1).

The two copies of $(0,\infty)\times\mathbf{L}$ in $T_{tot}\mathbf{L}$ are disjoint from each other, and are separately just trivial Legendrian cobordisms. If $L\to T^*M$ is an embedding, they are unlinked. That is, for any $N>0$, there is a homogeneous Hamiltonian isotopy (in the sense of §2.11) $h:T^{*,\circ}(M\times\mathbf{R})\times(0,\infty)\to T^{*,\circ}(M\times\mathbf{R})$ whose graph convolved with $\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-N}\mathbf{L}$ is $T_{tot}\mathbf{L}$.

To construct h, first let $H:T^{*,\circ}(M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathbf{R}$ be the function $(x,\xi,t,\tau)\mapsto-\tau$. At time s, the Hamiltonian flow φ^s_H is the shifting operator T_{-s}. Choose a homogeneous bump function $b_\epsilon:T^{*,\circ}(M\times\mathbf{R})\to\mathbf{R}$ smoothly depending on $\epsilon\in\mathbf{R}_{>0}$ such that $b_\epsilon=1$ in an open neighborhood of $\bigcup_{s>\epsilon}\mathrm{Cone}(T_{-s}\mathbf{L})$ and $\mathrm{supp}(b_\epsilon)\cap\mathrm{Cone}(\mathbf{L})=\varnothing$. Since π_{lag} is an embedding, for any $N>0$ the Hamiltonian flow $\varphi^{s-N}_{H_\epsilon}$ of the function $H_\epsilon:=b_\epsilon\cdot H$ takes $\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-N}\mathbf{L}$ to $\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-s}\mathbf{L}$ for any $s>\epsilon$. Then for h we can take $\{\varphi^{s-N}_{H_{\frac12 s}}\}_{s\in(0,\infty)}$.

To prove (3.15.2), we want to apply (2.11.1) to h — but we first have to modify h to be horizontally compactly supported over compact subintervals of $(0,\infty)$. We will construct an isotopy h^K for each $K\ll0$ over the time interval $(0,|K|)$, and we will take $K\to-\infty$. Explicitly, for any $K\ll0$ such that $\eta(4K)<\delta$ and $\eta(K)<\epsilon$, where η,ϵ,δ are as in Lemma 3.6, choose an increasing bump function $c_K:\mathbf{R}\to\mathbf{R}$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(c_K)\subset(4K,\infty)$ and $c_K|_{(K+1,\infty)}=1$. Let $H^K_{\frac12 s}=(c_K\circ t)\cdot H_{\frac12 s}$. The bump functions b_ϵ and c_K, can be chosen so that the Hamiltonian isotopy

$$h^K:=\{\varphi^{s-\delta}_{H^K_{\frac12 s}}\}_{s\in(0,|K|)}$$

is horizontally compactly supported over any compact subinterval of $(0, |K|)$, and for all $s \in (0, |K|)$

$$\pi_{\mathrm{f}}(\varphi^{s-\delta}_{H_L^{K-s}\frac{1}{2}s}(T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L})) \cap M \times (4K, 2K+1)$$
$$= \bigcup_{|2K+1|<r<|4K|} \pi_{\mathrm{f}}(\varphi^{\eta(-r)+s(r)}_{H_L}(\Lambda)) \times \{-r\},$$

for some function $s(r) < \epsilon$ and $\varphi^s_{H_L}$ is the flow introduced in Lemma 3.6.

By Lemma 3.6, we have compatible natural equivalences $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times (K_1, K_2)) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda\cup\varphi^{\epsilon}_{H_L}(\Lambda)}(M)$ for $-\infty \le K_1 < K_2 \ll 0$ and $0 < \epsilon \ll \delta$. These give a natural equivalence $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times (K, \infty))$ for $K \ll 0$. Let $h^K(\mathbf{L} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L})$ be the image of $\mathbf{L} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}$ under the Hamiltonian isotopy h^K. In the same way, we have compatible equivalences $\mathrm{Sh}_{h^K(\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L})}((0, -\frac{1}{2}K) \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \simeq \mathrm{Sh}_{T_{tot}\mathbf{L}}((0, -\frac{1}{2}K) \times M \times \mathbf{R})$ for $K \ll 0$. Taking $K \to -\infty$ and applying (2.11.1), we have the desired equivalence $\mathrm{Sh}_{T_{tot}\mathbf{L}}((0, \infty) \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$.

3.16. **Proposition.** *Suppose $F, G \in \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$, and let $G \to T_{-\delta}G$ be the map (3.14.4).*

(1) *For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, the map $\mathrm{Hom}(F, G) \to \mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta}G)$ is an isomorphism.*
(2) *If $L \to T^*M$ is an embedding, then for all $\delta > 0$, the map $\mathrm{Hom}(F, G) \to \mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta}G)$ is an isomorphism and $\mathrm{Hom}(T_{-\delta}F, G) = 0$.*

Proof. By (3.15.1), whenever $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ is sufficiently small, the map $\mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta_1}G) \to \mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta_2}G)$ induced by putting $\delta = \delta_2 - \delta_1$ in (3.14.4) is an isomorphism. It follows that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(F, \varprojlim_{\delta>0} T_{-\delta}G) \to \mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta}G)$$

is an isomorphism for δ sufficiently small. But the map $G \to \varprojlim_{\delta>0} T_{-\delta}G$ induced by the isomorphism $\mathbf{k}_{\{0\}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \varprojlim_{\delta>0} \Sigma\mathbf{k}_{(-\infty,-\delta]}$ is an isomorphism whenever $G \in \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ — this proves (1).

Together with (3.15.1) (1) implies that the map $\mathrm{Hom}(F, G) \to \mathrm{Hom}(F, T_{-\delta}G)$ is an isomorphism for every $\delta > 0$. To prove the remaining half of (2), we may assume (again by (3.15.1)) that $\delta \gg 0$. Let $H = \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(T_{-\delta}F, G)$ — where in this presentable setting the internal Hom is formally defined to be the object representing the functor $\mathrm{Hom}(T_{-\delta}F \otimes_{\mathbf{k}} -, G)$. Then H is constructible with respect to a stratification of $M \times \mathbf{R}$ refining $\mathbf{F} \cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{F}$. For $\delta \gg C \gg 0, K \ll 0$, there is a horizontally compactly supported homogeneous Hamiltonian flow on $T^{*,\circ}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ which carries $(T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L} \cup \mathbf{L}) \cap (T^*M \times (K, C))$ to $(T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L} \cup (\Lambda \times \mathbf{R})) \cap ((T^*M) \times (K, C))$. Then $-dt$ (where t is the projection $M \times \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$) is not in its singular support by [KaSc, Prop. 5.4.14]. The microlocal Morse lemma completes the proof. □

3.17. **Theorem.** *If $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small relative to $\mathbf{L}$, then on $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ the functor $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ is isomorphic to a composite functor*

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \xrightarrow{\mu\mathrm{mon}} \Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$$

where ι is a full embedding.

Proof. The fact that the primitive §3.2 is proper and has only finitely many critical values implies that for $K \ll 0$, the front projection $\mathbf{L} \to M \times \mathbf{R}$ is topologically trivial above $M \times (-\infty, K)$. In fact it is diffeomorphic to the product of $\Lambda \to M$ with $(-\infty, K)$. As

a consequence, for any $\delta_0 > 0$ we may find a K such that for all positive $\delta < \delta_0$, the restriction functors

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty)) \\ \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M\times\mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty)) \end{array} \tag{3.17.1}$$

are equivalences. The top functor of (3.17.1) carries $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(M\times\mathbf{R})$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(M\times(K,\infty))$. For the rest of the proof let us fix such a δ_0 and K. Thus, if we write $L_{>K}$ for the subset of L on which the primitive takes values $> K$, to prove the theorem it suffices to construct a fully faithful functor (that we will also denote by ι) from $\Gamma(L_{>K},\mathrm{Brane}_L)$ to $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty))$, such that the composite

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty)) \xrightarrow{\mu\mathrm{mon}} \Gamma(L_{>K},\mathrm{Brane}_L) \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty)) \tag{3.17.2}$$

is isomorphic to $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ (or more precisely to $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ followed by restriction from $M\times(K-\delta,\infty)$ to $M\times(K,\infty)$ — we will abuse notation and denote this simply by $T_{(-\delta,0]}$).

Define the "big cushion" of a good cylinder $B\times(a,b)$ to be the supremum of those $\delta > 0$ such that $B\times(a+\delta,b+\delta)$ is a good cylinder. When δ is smaller than the big cushion, the restriction functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(B\times(a-\delta,b)) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(B\times(a,b))$$

is an equivalence. Because of this, $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ induces a functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(B\times I) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(B\times I) \tag{3.17.3}$$

by first applying the correspondence

$$B\times(a,b) \leftarrow B\times(a,b)\times[-\delta,0) \to B\times(a-\delta,b) \qquad \text{maps as in (3.13.1)}$$

and then restricting to $B\times(a,b)$. If Ω is a branch or union of branches of $\mathbf{L}$ over $B\times I$, then (3.17.3) carries $\mathrm{Sh}_\Omega(B\times I)$ to $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(B\times I)$, and annihilates $\mathrm{Loc}(B\times I)$,

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a good cylindrical cover of $M\times(K,\infty)$, and suppose that the big cushion of every chart in $\mathcal{V}$ is larger than δ. We may regard Loc, $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}$, and $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}$ as objects of $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}},\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}})$, by restriction. (3.17.3) determines a morphism

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}} \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}} \qquad \text{in } \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}},\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}) \tag{3.17.4}$$

whose image under $\varprojlim_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}},\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}) \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is $T_{(-\delta,0]}$. (3.17.4) kills Loc objectwise, so by the universal property of localization and [Lu1, Cor. 5.1.2.3], it determines a commutative triangle in $\Delta^2 \to \mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}},\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}})$ of the form

(3.17.5)



The image of (3.17.5) under $\varprojlim$ is

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty)) \to \varprojlim_{\mathcal{V}}(L,\mathrm{Brane}_L) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M\times(K,\infty))$$

where we draw only the top two arrows to save space. We will show that when δ is sufficiently small, the first arrow in this is isomorphic to μmon and the second arrow is fully faithful, proving (3.17.2).

Let us define the "small cushion" of a good cylinder to be the supremum of those δ such that the functor

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(B\times I)/\mathrm{Loc}(B\times I) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(B\times I) \tag{3.17.6}$$

induced by (3.17.3) is a full embedding. The small cushion of every good cylinder is positive, by (3.10.3). When the small cushion is larger than δ, let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B \times I)$ be the essential image of (3.17.6).

The functor $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ is very local in the sense that for any $F \in \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(B \times (a,b))$, $T_{(-\delta,0]}F|_{B'\times(a',b')}$ only relies on $F|_{B'\times(a',b'+\delta)}$. Thus, if $B' \times I' \subset B \times I$ is a pair of good cylinders both of whose small cushions are larger than δ, the restriction functor carries $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B \times I)$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B' \times I')$.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a good cylindrical cover of $M \times (K,\infty)$ §3.12. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{Cylb}$ be the set of triples (B, I, Ω) such that $B \times I \in \mathcal{V}$. As $\mathbf{F} \cap [K,\infty)$ is compact, we may suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ is finite. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that the small cushion of every good cylinder in $\mathcal{U}$ is larger than δ. Now $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}$ is a functor $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$, and the full embeddings $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B \times I) \subset \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(B \times I)$ give a morphism in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}})$. In particular they give a full embedding

$$\varprojlim_{\mathcal{V}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B \times I) \hookrightarrow \varprojlim_{\mathcal{V}} \mathrm{Sh}_{all}(B \times I) \tag{3.17.7}$$

The codomain of (3.17.7) is naturally equivalent to $\mathrm{Sh}_{all}(M \times (K,\infty))$ §2.2.5, and under this equivalence the essential image of (3.17.7) lies in $\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times (K,\infty))$.

Since $\mathcal{U}$ is a Čech covering of $L_{>K}$, we have

$$\Gamma(L_{>K}, \mathrm{Brane}_L) \cong \varprojlim_{\mathcal{U}} \mathrm{Brane}_L(B \times I, \Omega) \tag{3.17.8}$$

The limit on the right-hand side is equivalent to $\varprojlim_{\mathcal{V}} \bigoplus_{\Omega} \mathrm{Brane}_L(B \times I, \Omega)$, where the sum is over the branches of $\mathbf{L}$ over $B \times I$. The two functors

$$B \times I \mapsto \bigoplus_{\Omega} \mathrm{Brane}_L(B \times I, \Omega), \qquad B \times I \mapsto \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{L}}(B \times I)/\mathrm{Loc}(B \times I) \tag{3.17.9}$$

are isomorphic in $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}})$ by the Proposition of §3.10. The two functors

$$B \times I \mapsto \bigoplus_{\Omega} \mathrm{Brane}_L(B \times I, \Omega), \qquad B \times I \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{L},\delta}(B \times I) \tag{3.17.10}$$

are isomorphic by (3.17.6). Now (3.17.7) together with (3.17.8) gives the fully faithful functor ι in (3.17.2). □

3.18. **Nadler-Zaslow without Floer theory.** We are now ready to construct the functor (1.0.1). In this section we will prove that in (1.7.1), when $L \to T^*M$ is an embedding the left-hand arrow (μmon) in (1.7.1) is an equivalence, and that if Λ is smooth the right-hand arrow ($\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}$) is fully faithful.

By Theorem 3.17, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that the functor μmon is isomorphic to the functor $T_{(-\delta,0]}$. By §3.15, if π_{lag} is an embedding then $T_{(-\delta,0]}$ is isomorphic to $T_{(-C,0]}$ for any C large or small, so to prove that μmon is an equivalence it suffices to find any C such that $T_{(-C,0]}$ is an equivalence. If K is such that the restriction functor $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times (K,\infty))$ is an equivalence, then for any $C > |K|$ the composite

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-C}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times (K,\infty)) \leftarrow \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$$

is an inverse functor to $T_{(-C,0]}$.

Now let us prove that $\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}$ is fully faithful. Fix F and G in $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}; \mathbf{k})$. We have an adjoint isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}F, \mathrm{proj}_{1,*}G) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{proj}_1^*\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}F, G)$$

The sheaf $\mathrm{proj}_1^*\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}F$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}F \boxtimes \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{R}}$, in particular it has singular support in $\Lambda \times \mathbf{R}$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.16, for $C_1 \gg C_2 \gg 0, K \ll 0$, there

is a horizontally compactly supported homogeneous Hamiltonian flow on $T^{*,\circ}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ which carries $(T_{C_1}\mathbf{L} \cup \mathbf{L}) \cap (T^*M \times (K, C_2))$ to $((\Lambda \times \mathbf{R}) \cup \mathbf{L}) \cap ((T^*M) \times (K, C_2))$, and this Hamiltonian flow induces an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{proj}_1^* \mathrm{proj}_{1,*} F, G) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(T_{C_1} F, G)$$

But as $L \to T^*M$ is an embedding this is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Hom}(F, G)$ by Proposition 3.16(2).

Example. If $L = \Gamma_{d\log(m)}$ is a standard Lagrangian, then $\mathbf{F}$ is just the graph of $\log(m)$. Every sheaf in $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R})$ has the form j_*F, where F is locally constant on $\{(x,t) \mid m(x) \geq t\}$. The functor $\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}$ carries this to a standard sheaf on M, just as in the Nadler-Zaslow correspondence. A more thorough comparison of (1.7.1) and Nadler-Zaslow will appear elsewhere.

3.19. **Hamiltonian invariance.** Let L_0 and L_1 be two embedded lower exact Lagrangians whose wavefront maps $L_i \to M \times \mathbf{R}$ are finite-to-one. Let $\phi_t : T^*M \to T^*M$ be a Hamiltonian flow such that $\phi_1(L_0) = L_1$. Then the suspension of ϕ_t is a Lagrangian concordance $b : \mathbf{R} \times L \to T^*(\mathbf{R} \times L)$. We also assume that b is lower exact and that its wavefront in $\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R}$ is topologically a product over $\mathbf{R} \times M \times (-\infty, K)$ for some $K \ll 0$. For example, if L_0 and L_1 are the lower exact perturbations of two eventually conic exact Lagrangians L_0' and L_1', then we may find such a b if L_0' and L_1' are Hamiltonian isotopic by a compactly supported isotopy.

Without any further loss of generality, we will also assume that $\phi_t = 1_{T^*M}$ for $t < 0$ and $\phi_t = \phi_1$ for $t > 1$.

By (2.11.1), the restriction functors

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}_i}(M \times \mathbf{R})$$

are equivalences for $i = 0, 1$. The wavefront of b may not be finite-to-one, but by a generic, horizontally compact supported Hamiltonian perturbation, we obtain another lower exact Lagrangian concordance $B : \mathbf{R} \times L \to T^*(\mathbf{R} \times L)$ that is finite to one — we do not require that B is the suspension of Hamiltonian isotopy. Again by GKS, we have an equivalence $\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \cong \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R})$ that is the identity outside a compact subset of $\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R}$ — we may assume it is the identity outside of $[0,1] \times M \times (K, \infty)$. Let $\mathbf{U}_0 = (-\infty, 0) \times \mathbf{L}_0$ and $\mathbf{U}_1 = (1, \infty) \times \mathbf{L}_1$. Then the restriction maps

$$\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{U}_0}((-\infty, 0) \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \leftarrow \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{R} \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \to \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{U}_1}((1, \infty) \times M \times \mathbf{R}) \tag{3.19.1}$$

are equivalences. By the topological triviality of $\mathbf{B}$ over $\mathbf{R} \times M \times (-\infty, K)$, those equivalences are intertwined with

$$\mathrm{Sh}_{(-\infty,0)\times\Lambda}((-\infty, 0) \times M) \leftarrow \mathrm{Sh}_{\mathbf{R}\times\Lambda}(\mathbf{R} \times M) \to \mathrm{Sh}_{(1,\infty)\times\Lambda}((1, \infty) \times M) \tag{3.19.2}$$

by the pushforwards $\mathrm{proj}_{(-\infty,0)\times M,*}$, $\mathrm{proj}_{\mathbf{R}\times M,*}$, $\mathrm{proj}_{(1,\infty)\times M,*}$ onto the first two factors. As Brane is locally constant and the maps $L_i \to B$ are homotopy equivalences, the restriction functors

$$\Gamma((-\infty, 0) \times L_0, \mathrm{Brane}_B) \leftarrow \Gamma(B, \mathrm{Brane}_B) \to \Gamma((1, \infty) \times L_1, \mathrm{Brane}_B) \tag{3.19.3}$$

are also equivalences, and $\mu\mathrm{mon}$ intertwines (3.19.1) and (3.19.3).

3.20. **Functoriality for pullbacks.** We deduced the Hamiltonian invariance of (1.7.1) from the compatibilty of our constructions with restriction to open subsets of M. There is a similar functoriality property for a more general class of maps.

Let L, M continue to be as in §3.2, and $\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{L}$ as in §3.3. Let M' be another smooth manifold and let $f : M' \to M$ be smooth. We will say f is transverse to L if it is transverse to the composite map $L \to T^*M \to M$. In that case put $L' = L \times_M M'$ — it is a smooth manifold whose projection $L' \to f^{-1}T^*M \to T^*M'$ is a lower exact Lagrangian immersion. The wavefront of L' is the inverse image of $\mathbf{F} \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$ along $f \times 1_{\mathbf{R}}$ — let us write this as $\mathbf{F}' \subset M' \times \mathbf{R}$ for short.

When Λ is smooth, there is a natural commutative diagram in $\mathrm{St}_{\mathbf{k}}$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\Gamma(L, \mathrm{Brane}_L) & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}} & \mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda}(M) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (f\times 1_{\mathbf{R}})^*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f^*} \\
\Gamma(L', \mathrm{Brane}_{L'}) & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}'}(M' \times \mathbf{R}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}]{} & \mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda'}(M')
\end{array}$$

Or equivalently, after Theorem 3.17,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) & \xleftarrow{T_{(-\delta,0]}} & \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}}(M \times \mathbf{R}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}} & \mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda}(M) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (f\times 1_{\mathbf{R}})^*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f^*} \\
\mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}'\cup T_{-\delta}\mathbf{L}'}(M' \times \mathbf{R}) & \xleftarrow[T_{(-\delta,0]}]{} & \mathrm{Sh}^0_{\mathbf{L}'}(M' \times \mathbf{R}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{proj}_{1,*}]{} & \mathrm{Sh}_{\Lambda'}(M')
\end{array}$$

The commutativity of both squares follows from proper base change — before applying it to the right square, compactify $M \times \mathbf{R}$ to $M \times [-\infty, \infty)$ as in (3.3.1).

REFERENCES

[Ab] M. Abouzaid, "Nearby Lagrangians with vanishing Maslov class are homotopy equivalent." Invent. Math. **189** (2012)

[AbKr] M. Abouzaid and T. Kragh, "On the immersion classes of nearby Lagrangians," J. Topol. **9** (2016)

[ABGHR1] M. Ando, A. Blumberg, D. Gepner, M. Hopkins, and C. Rezk, "An ∞-categorical approach to R-line bundles, R-module Thom spectra, and twisted R-homology," J. Topol. **7** (2014)

[ABGHR2] M. Ando, A. Blumberg, D. Gepner, M. Hopkins, and C. Rezk, "Units of ring spectra, orientations, and Thom spectra via rigid infinite loop space theory," J. Topol. **7** (2014), no. 4, 1077–1117.

[Arn1] V. Arnold, "On characteristic class entering into conditions of quantization," Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen **1** (1967)

[Arn2] V. Arnold, S. Gusein-Zade, and A. Varchenko, "Singularities of differentiable maps, Vol. I. The classification of critical points, caustics and wave fronts." Translated from the Russian by Ian Porteous and Mark Reynolds. Monographs in Mathematics, **82**. Birkhäuser (1985)

[ArGi] V. Arnold and A. Givental, "Symplectic geometry," Dynamical systems iV, 1-138, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., **4**, Springer (2001)

[CiEl] K. Cielebak and Y. Eliashberg, "From Stein to Weinstein and back. Symplectic geometry of affine complex manifolds". American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 59 (2012)

[CJS] R. Cohen, J. Jones, G. Segal, "Floer's infinite-dimensional Morse theory and homotopy theory," in The Floer memorial volume, 297-325 (1995)

[DI] D. Dugger and D. Isaksen, "Topological hypercovers and $\mathbf{A}^1$-realizations," Math. Z. **246** (2004)

[Del] P. Deligne, "Cohomologie à supports propres," Exposé XVII in SGA4

[Doug] C. Douglas, "Twisted parametrized stable homotopy theory," unpublished Ph.D. thesis available at arXiv:0508070

[GaRo] D. Gaitsgory and N. Rozenblyum, "A study in derived algebraic geometry," http://www.math.harvard.edu/∼gaitsgde/GL/

[Gei] H. Geiges, "An introduction to contact topology," Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **109**. (2008)

[Give] A. Givental, "Nonlinear generalization of the Maslov index," Theory of singularities and its applications, 71-103, Adv. Soviet Math., **1**, Amer. Math. Soc. (1990)

[GMac] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson, "Stratified Morse theory," Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], **14**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1988)

[Guil] S. Guillermou, "Quantization of conic Lagrangian submanifolds of cotangent bundles," arXiv:1212.5818

[GKS] S. Guillermou, M. Kashiwara, and P. Schapira, "Sheaf quantization of Hamiltonian isotopies and applications to non displaceability problems," to appear at Duke Math. Journal (2010)

[Kash] M. Kashiwara, "On the maximally overdetermined system of linear differential equations, I," Publ. RIMS, (1975)

[KaSc] M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira, "Sheaves on manifolds," with a chapter in French by Christian Houzel. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 292. Springer-Verlag (1994)

[J1] X. Jin, "Holomorphic Lagrangian branes correspond to perverse sheaves," Geom. Topol. (2015)

[J2] X. Jin, "Representing the big tilting sheaves as holomorphic Morse branes," arXiv:1602.07382

[KaRo] A. Kapustin and L. Rozansky, "Three-dimensional topological field theory and symplectic algebraic geometry II." Commun. Number Theory Phys. (2010)

[Kr1] T. Kragh, "Parametrized ring spectra and the nearby Lagrangian conjecture", Geom. Topol. (2013)

[Kr2] T. Kragh, "The Viterbo transfer as a map of spectra," arXiv:0712.2533

[LiZh1] Y. Liu and W. Zheng, "Gluing restricted nerves of ∞-categories," arXiv:1211.5294

[LiZh2] Y. Liu and W. Zheng, "Enhanced six operations and base change theorem for Artin stacks," arXiv:1211.5948

[Lu1] J. Lurie, "Higher topos theory," Annals of Mathematics Studies, **170**. Princeton University Press (2009)

[Lu2] J. Lurie, "Higher algebra," http://www.math.harvard.edu/∼lurie/papers/HA.pdf

[Lu3] J. Lurie, "Rotation invariance in algebraic K-theory," http://www.math.harvard.edu/∼lurie/papers/Waldhaus.pdf

[Lu4] J. Lurie, "On ∞-topoi," arXiv:math/0306109

[Nadl] D. Nadler, "Microlocal branes are constructible sheaves," Selecta Math (2009) no. **4**

[NaTa] D. Nadler and H. Tanaka, "A stable ∞-category of Lagrangian cobordisms" arXiv:1109.4835

[NaZa] D. Nadler and E. Zaslow, "Constructible sheaves and the Fukaya category," J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009)

[RoSc] M. Robalo and P. Schapira, "A lemma for microlocal sheaf theory in the ∞-categorical setting," arXiv:1611.06789

[Seid] P. Seidel "Graded Lagrangian submanifolds," Bull. Soc. Math. France **128** (2000)

[STZ] V. Shende, D. Treumann, E. Zaslow "Legendrian knots and constructible sheaves," Invent. Math. 207 (2017), no. **3**

[STWZ] V. Shende, D. Treumann, H. Williams, and E. Zaslow, "Cluster varieties from Legendrian knots," arXiv:1512.08942

[Tam1] D. Tamarkin, "Microlocal condition for non-displaceability," arXiv:0809.1584

[Tam2] D. Tamarkin, "Microlocal category", arXiv:1511.08961

[TZ] D. Treumann and E. Zaslow, "Polytopes and skeleta," arXiv:1109.4430

[Wein] A. Weinstein "The Maslov cycle as a Legendrian singularity and the projection of a wavefront set," Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **44** (2013), no. **4**